

St. Valloy his book

Light broke forth in WALES,

Expelling DARKNESS ;

OR THE

Englishman's Love to the Antient Britains.

BEING

An ANSWER to a BOOK, Intituled,
Children's Baptism from Heaven ; published
in the *Welsh Tongue*, by Mr. James Owen.

Wherein his *Twelve Arguments*, for the
baptizing of the *Children of the Faithful*,
are examined and confuted, and Infant-
Baptism overthrown.

Also proving that *Baptizing* is *Dipping* the
whole Body in Water, *in the Name of the*
Father, &c. And that Believers are only
the Subjects of Baptism.

In which the *Anti-pedo-baptists* are cleared
from all those unjust *Reproaches* and *Calum-*
nies, cast upon them by the said Mr. Owen.

By BENJAMIN KEACH.

Bernard Serm. 66. in Cantica.

Irident nos quia Baptizamus infantes, quod oramus pro
mortuis, quod sanctorum suffragia postulamus.

Mat. 3. 16. Ende Jesus gedoopt zyn de, is terfont opgek-
lomen pit hij Water. Taken out of the Dutch Testament ;
in English thus, And when Jesus was dipped, he came out of the
Water.

London, Printed, and sold by William Marshal at the
Bible in Newgate-street, 1696.

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y.

1891

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y.

1891

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y.

1891

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y.

1891

THE NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

ASTOR LENOX TILDEN FOUNDATION

500 N. 5TH ST. NEW YORK, N. Y.

1891

To all Godly Christians who are Pedo-baptists, in South and North-VVales, Grace, Mercy, and Peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

You Worthy Brethren, and *Antient Britains,*

I Kindly salute you in the Bowels of Christian Love, and Sincere Affections; I cannot but love all who have the Image of my Heavenly Father stamp't upon their Souls: 'Tis not your Opinion of *Pedo-Baptism* (tho' an Error) that shall alienate my Heart from you, nor restrain that *Catholick Love* that should run in all the Veins of every one that is born of God; tho' I am an Enemy to your Opinion and Practice, in that case, yet a dear Lover of your Persons, and precious Souls. And I have so much Charity to believe, that 'tis through Ignorance you err in that Matter, and that God hath for some wise ends hid the truth of his Holy Ordinance of Gospel-Baptism at present from you; and do hope, did you see otherwise, you would practise otherwise; *Charity thinketh no evil*, &c: 1 Cor. 13. One Reason of my writing this Epistle to you is to answer what Mr. *James Owen* in his Epistle to his late Treatise hath wrote unto you, in which there are several Positions and unsound Notions laid down and asserted by him, which I am persuaded I ought to detect and witness against, as well as answer his Book, which are not only contained in his Epistle to you, but that also to the Reverend Mr. *Samuel Jones*.

To confirm Infant-Baptism upon the Covenant of Grace, he asserts, in his Epistle to Mr. *Jones*, these words, viz.
 " I being desired and importuned by you to maintain this
 " present Truth which setteth forth Infants Right unto the
 " Privileges of the New Covenant, a Truth builded upon
 " the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, even as antient as the Covenant of Grace, which was made with
 " Adam and his Seed, &c.

iv *The Epistle to the Godly Pede-Baptists.*

Ans. Doth Mr. Owen think that we deny that any of our Children have right to the Covenant of Grace? God forbid; the Controversy lies not there: for all our Children that are elected, are decretively in the Covenant of Grace, also virtually by the Death and Merits of Jesus Christ, and also actually they are and shall be in it when they believe, or when they have Union with Christ; but that the Children of the Faithful as such, or (as so considered) are in the Covenant of Grace, we do utterly deny.

2. If the Covenant of Grace was made with Adam, and his Natural Seed as such, will it not follow that he owns Universal Salvation?

Can any Perish that are in the Covenant of Grace? Is not that an everlasting Covenant, well ordered in all things and sure? 2 Sam. 23. 5. and is not the Promise sure to all the seed? Rom. 4. 16. it being not only confirmed to them all by the Promise, but also by the Oath of God, Heb. 6. 13—18 17. But,

3. Doth not the Covenant and Promise to Adam run only to Christ Jesus, or referr to him, who is there meant by the Seed of the Woman? True, we will allow that it comprehendeth also all the Elect of God, in a large sense; but primarily and directly to Christ personally considered. But can any think this Promise is limited to the Carnal Seed of Believers or runs so? My Brethren, There are two Seeds, the one is called, *The Seed of the Woman*, which we affirm, is only Christ and all the Elect in him; and to all these the Covenant of Grace doth appertain, and to no more, as to the Special Blessings and Privileges thereof. The other are called, *The Seed of the Serpent*, who are the Ungodly; which proceed some of them from the Loins of the Faithful, as well as from the Loins of the Wicked; for as some Unbelievers Seed are in the Election of Grace, so some of the Seed of Believers are none of the Elect.

“ But to proceed, saith he, if the Children of the Faithful, are out of the Covenant of Grace, they have no Hope, and are without God in the World.

Ans. We, and all our Children, by Nature were dead in Sins and Trespases, and Children of Wrath, as others; and so without Hope and without God in the World, Eph. 2. 13. before we Believed, this was our Condition, and are not our Children naturally in this state?

But,

But, what tho? yet when God calls them, renews them, and translates them, out of the *First-Adam*, and grafts them into the *Second-Adam*, they have the same Hope, and the same God to be their God, as we have.

Again, He saith, " Doubtless, the First Covenant doth condemn them because of Original Sin, and if without interest in the Covenant of Grace, the Wrath of God abideth on them; but God forbid that we should think there's more Vertue in the *First-Adam* to Condemnation, than there is in the *Second Adam* to Save.

Ans. The case is plain, the *First-Adam*, and all his, as so considered, were lost, being Children of Wrath and of Condemnation: And the *Second-Adam*, and all his, are, or shall be saved, being Children of the Promise, and of Eternal Salvation. But doth Mr. *Owen* think, that all the Children of the Faithful, as such, are the Seed or Children of the *Second-Adam*?

I say again, Are all our Children in the Election of Grace, or doth Election run only in that Line?

" If the *First-Adam* had stood, we and our Children would have stood: Doth Faith in the *Second-Adam*, make the Condition of our Children worse than it should be through the Obedience of the *First-Adam*?

Ans. Must God save all the Children of the *First-Adam* by the Obedience of the *Second*, because, if *Adam* had stood none of his Children had fallen? What Doctrine is this? You out-do all the *Arminians* I have yet met with, but O! the Riches of God's Sovereign Grace, to any of the lost Seed of Rebellious Mankind.

If this you intend not, yet is every Believer a like common or publick Head to his natural Off-spring, as *Adam* was to his? Christ only is the publick Head of his Seed; a Believer's Faith objectively justifies and saves himself only, not his Children. Could Reverend Mr. *Jones* find no better a Pen to defend his Cause of *Pedo-Baptism*? My Faith may be said to unite me to Christ; but doth it also unite my Child to Christ? Whatsoever good Children do receive from their believing Parents, besure the Parent's Faith doth not render his Child a Believer, but however my Faith doth not make the Condition of my Child worse than it was, and it may not make the Condition of my Child better; for all the good Counsel, Education, good Example and Prayers; some Children have from their Godly Parents, they make them not the

vi *The Epistle to the Godly Peditors,*

better, 'Tis not in him that willet, nor in him that runneth, but in God that sheweth Mercy.

" You intimate what Cause there is of bitter Sorrow in the Churches of God, that the Major part of their Children are cut off from the Covenant of Salvation.

Ans. Our Doctrine cuts off not one Child of any Believer that is in the Covenant of Salvation; if God hath elected the major part of the Children of the Faithfull, we say they shall be saved: 'Tis impossible for any to cut off one of God's Elect. But what is this to their Children, as such, or to the positive Right any of our Infants have to Baptism? Do you cut off your Infants from the Covenant of Salvation, because you will not give them the Blood of the Covenant (I mean the Lord's Supper)?

Brethren, Both the Sacraments are Ordinances that are of meer positive Right, viz. depending (as to the Subjects and all Matters thereunto belonging) upon the Sovereign Will and Pleasure of the Lord Jesus, the great Law-giver; and as they that come to one Ordinance are to examine themselves and to discern the Lord's Body: So all they that come to the other are to believe in Christ, and to repent from dead Works.

You mistake, 'tis not the Eternal Covenant of Grace that you say you stand up in the Gap to maintain, but you strive to introduce, in Gospel-Times, an external relative Covenant according to the Flesh, like that Covenant of Peculiarity which God made with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed, as he was a publick Head and Father of the whole House of *Israel*, or of the National, Political and Typical Church of the Jews: Nay, you would fain have all the Seed of Believers to be in that Covenant, that peculiarly and absolutely did belong to the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, as such, and none else. Now 'tis this thing which we deny; we say that there was a two-fold Covenant made with *Abraham*, signified by *Sarah* and *Agar*: And tho there was Grace and Mercy in both, yet the Covenant of Grace or Free Promise was not made to *Seeds*, as of many, i. e. not to all the natural Seed of *Abraham*, or Seed of Believers, as such, but primarily it was made to Christ, and in him to all the Elect, who alone are in the Eternal Covenant of Grace: That the Election takes hold both of some of Believers Seed and some of the Seed of Unbelievers is evident; and tho God may comprehend in his Eternal Love more of our Seed than of the Seed of Unbelievers,

vers, yet I have proved in this Treatise and Reply to Mr. *Owen*, that the Covenant of Grace and the Election of God runs not to the Seed of the Faithful, as such; and also that Believers Seed nor Unbelievers Seed, until they believe in Christ, ought to be baptized, nor taken into the Visible Church; because 'tis not the Covenant of Grace, considered as such, that gives any Person a Right to Baptism, but the meer positive Command of our Lord Jesus Christ; whose express Command and Commission enjoins none to be baptized but such who are Believers, or such who are discipled by preaching the Word, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 16. *John* 4. 1. *Acts* 2. 37. *Acts* 8. 12, 14. *Acts* 8. 37. *Acts* 10. 47. *Acts* 16. 30, 31. *Acts* 18. 8. *Rom.* 6. 3, 4.

“ Mr. *Owen* tells Mr. *Jones*, who he says hath the Tongue of the Learned, that his desire was that he would be a Disputant for those Weaklings who are not able to dispute for themselves.

Reply. He tells us one while that Mr. *Jones* desired and importuned him to write his Treatise, and at another time he says his Will and Desire was that Mr. *Jones* should do it.

As touching the Reverend Mr. *Samuel Jones*, I have had such an account of him, by a Worthy Minister, that I am fully satisfied, that had he wrote on this Subject, we should have had no such bitter Reflections or ill Treatment as we meet withal from this Man: He hath dipped his Pen into Gall and Wormwood, and hath made work for Repentance; besides, I am informed that Mr. *Jones* neither put him upon this Work nor approves of it, tho perhaps when he saw his Forwardness, he might say *Go on and do it.*

Sirs, those Weaklings he means need no such a Disputant; he hath done them no service, nor the Church of God either; we throw none of them out of that Eternal Covenant of which he speaks, nor can Men nor Angels do it; such of our Infants that are in the Eternal Covenant are safe enough: But we deny that our Infants are in that Covenant of *Peculiarity* which God made with *Abraham* and his natural Seed, as such. And this I doubt not but you will find in the ensuing Answer sufficiently proved. Moreover,

“ (He says) He stands up in the gap to maintain the Eternal Covenant which God made with the Faithful and their Seed.—Great is the Truth, and it will overcome.

Reply. He should not boast before he puts off his Armour; that may be a Truth in a Man's Opinion, which is a gross

viii *The Epistle to the Godly Pædo-Baptists.*

Error in it self. You will, when you have read our Answer, the better judg whether he hath prov'd the Baptism of Infants to be from Heaven, as in the Title of his Book he asserts it is. He farther says,

“ We are Fathers, and the Law of Nature teacheth us to preserve the Inheritance of our Children.

Reply. Our Affections are not less to our Children than his; we are *Fathers also*, but are not willing to give an Inheritance to our Children which of right belongs not unto them.

Grace, nor gracious Privileges, in the New Covenant, come to be the Inheritance of our Children, in a Natural way, as they are our Off-spring; tho evident it is in the Covenant of Peculiarity God made with *Abraham*, the Jews and their Seed, as such, had an Inheritance given them by the Lord, *i.e.* many Legal and External Privileges, besides the Land of *Canaan*, which Circumcision was a Token or Sign of; but we and our Children have no right to that Inheritance: They had the *Shadow*, we and our Children that believe have the *Substance*; they had the *Shell*, we the *Kernel*: The true Inheritance is by Faith, that it might appear to be of Grace, and not in Circumcision, nor in Baptism, but by Faith only. Therefore when our Children are called of God, or do believe in Christ, they have right to the Inheritance which Baptism is a sign of; and what signifies the sign without the thing signified? You our Brethren the *Pædo-baptists* give your Children the Name, but not the Nature of Christ; what is the lofty Title of Earl, or Duke, and no Estate suitable to that fancy'd Honour?

“ Mr. *Owen* saith, We are Stewards over the House of God, and we ought to protect the Feeble and Afflicted; we are Shepherds, and our duty is to provide for the Lambs of the Flock, lest any cast them out of the Fold.

Reply. It is required in Stewards that they be Faithful, and to see that they give no portion of their Masters Goods to any, but to such he hath directed and commanded them so to do: Now Christ hath commanded his Stewards, or Ministers, no more to give Infants the Holy Ordinance of Baptism than the Lord's Supper. He therefore that doth it, let him answer it when our Lord comes.

2. Are our Infants Lambs in Christ's Fold, or feeble and afflicted Christians in Christ's Spiritual Family? Infants are committed to Ministers care, who are Natural Fathers, but not as Ministers; God never made his Ministers, Stewards

to take care of, and to be Nurses of little Infants: True, ~~new~~ born Babes in Christ, or Babes in Grace, they are to provide for, and take the care of; those Lambs they must see not cast out of Christ's Fold, when they are received in by Baptism, &c.

" VVe are Builders, saith he, and we ought to build the
" VValls of *Jerusalem*, working with one Hand in the VVork,
" and with the other holding a VVeapon, *Neb. 4. 17.* And
" we must not reject those small or little Stones, which the
" Father received into the old Building, whom the Son received into the new Building, and will be received by the
" Holy Ghost, *Mat. 19. Luke 1. 44.* who maketh them
" lively Stones of *Jerusalem* that is Above, and these Stones
" by some are cast into an unclean place without the City,
" *Levit. 14. 40.* God doth raise up Childreu unto *Abraham*, See *Mat. 3. 9.*

Reply. Because the old *Jerusalem*, by God's appointment, was built with dead Stones which was a Type of the New, will he, without Christ's Authority, build his New and Spiritual *Jerusalem* with such Materials? We deny not but that God did receive Infants, as such, into his old Building: But doth not *St. Peter* tell us, the Gospel-Temple is built up with Spiritual Stones, lively, or living Stones, *i. e.* Men and VVomen spiritually quickned by Divine Grace, or renewed by the Holy Spirit. Let him prove, if he can, that Christ received into the Gospel-Church any one Infant; and tho we deny not but elect Infants that die may be lively Stones in *Jerusalem Above*, I mean Heaven; yet it follows no more from thence that Infants ought to be baptized, than that they ought to partake of the Lord's Supper. Moreover, evident it is, that *John* in *Mat. 3. 9.* (the Text *Mr. Owen* quotes) doth deny such to have a right to Baptism that were the Seed or Children of *Abraham* according to the Fleth; *Think not to say within your selves, we have Abraham to our Father.* The Covenant of Peculiarity God made with *Abraham*, tho it gave right to his Male-Infants to Circumcision, yet it gives no right to Gospel-Baptism to any, either Young or Old, Male nor Female. God can raise up of Stones Children to *Abraham*, *i. e.* such that have no Descent from *Abraham*: So that it appears Fleshly Descent in Gospel-Times, signifies not any thing as to Gospel-Church-Membership.

Worthy Britains, Search the Scriptures, and be not mistaken about the Covenant God made with *Abraham*; you will find the

x *The Epistle to the Godly Pede-Baptists,*

the Covenant of Grace was one and the same from the beginning, and it was always held forth by way of a Free Promise, first to *Adam*, and so to *Abraham*, &c. but there was a Covenant made with *Noah*, and tho' it was full of Mercy to him and all Mankind, yet that was not simply in it self the Covenant of Grace: So also there was a Covenant made with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed, as such, which we call a Covenant of Peculiarity, or, which peculiarly did appertain to his Natural Seed or Off-spring; to which Covenant Circumcision did belong, which was distinct to the Free Promise, or Covenant of Grace, which God made with him, and with all the Elect in him. You may assure your selves that that Covenant in which there was mutual Restipulation between God and *Abraham* and his Carnal Seed, or between God and the whole House of *Israel* (and upon the Condition of Obedience thereunto, Life, length of Days, and the Earthly *Canaan* was promised, and upon their Disobedience Temporal Death was threatened) was not the Covenant of Grace, tho' it might be given in subserviency to the Gospel-Covenant, or the Covenant of Faith: And so it was as a School-master to bring them to Christ. 'Tis only the Holy Spirit, thro' Faith, that actually intiles us or our Children to the Covenant of Grace: We must believe, and our Children must believe, before either we or they can be actually in this Blessed Covenant, so as to have right to Baptism, I mean such of them that live, &c.

Also know, as I said before, that it is not the Covenant of Grace simply considered in it self that gives any Person a right to Gospel-Baptism, but the meer positive and express Command, Will and Pleasure of Christ the only Lawgiver: For the Covenant of Grace gave no Godly Man or his Male-Children, in *Abraham's* Time, or before or after, any right to Circumcision, but only God's Command to *Abraham*, which ran to those that proceeded from *Abraham's* Loins, or were bought with his Money. Brethren, Can any think that *Abraham* could purchase Men with Money, and that way bring them into the Covenant of Grace? No, 'tis nothing but the Purchase of Christ's Blood can do that.

In a word It is evident, that should we grant all that Mr. *Owen* and other *Pede-Baptists* say, That all the Children of Believers were in very deed in the Covenant of Grace; yet it would not follow from thence, that our Infants should be baptized, any more than that they ought to have the Lord's Supper given to them, as I said before; because both those

those Ordinances (as Circumcision was) are abso'utely of meer positive Right: Therefore we must know that 'tis the Will and Command of Christ in the New Testament, that Infants ought to be baptized, if they have right thereunto ; but since there is not the least Intimation given, in all God's Word, that 'tis his Pleasure they should be baptiz'd, it must be a piece of Will-worship to do it.

Object. But whereas 'tis objected, it may be gathered from Consequences that 'tis our Duty to baptize them.

I answer, In point of instituted Worship, or for any meer positive Legal or Gospel Ordinance, there ought to be an express Precept; tho we grant that many *Doctrinal Truths* may be drawn or inferred by Consequences from many Texts of Scripture. See Reverend Mr. *Greenhill*, on *Ezek. chap. 11. Vol. 2. p. 412.* " VVhat is clearly held out unto us in the Gospel (saith he) " let us consent in, and walk answerably; in what is dark " and doubtful let us forbear each other, and stay till God " reveals more. If we cannot unite in all, let us unite in " what is clear. Things Fundamental are clearest laid " down in the word; they are expressly commanded or held " forth in Scripture, whether they are Matters of Faith or " Practice, they are not drawn out by remote Consequences, " and strength of Men's Parts, but immediately from or in " the VVord. Thus Mr. *Greenhill*. Now we all agree that Baptism, tho it be not a Fundamental of Salvation, yet 'tis a Fundamental of Church-Constitution; there can be no true, right, orderly Gospel-Church, without Baptism. Therefore it is necessary that this should be laid down plainly in the Word of God; and so it is. We must first be *made Disciples, and then be baptized*, Mat. 28. 19, 20. John 4. 1. *first believe, and then be baptized*, Mark 16. 16. *Repent and be baptized*, Acts 2. 37. *If thou believest thou mayest*, Acts 8. 37. *Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized?* Acts 10. 47. *When they believed Philip, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of Grd, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both Men and Women*, Acts 8. 12. So Acts 16. 30, 31. Acts 18. 8. Rom. 6. 3, 4.

And as touching those Consequences that Mr. *Owen* and others draw from some Scriptures, to prove Infants Baptism, you will find in the ensuing Answer, those Consequences do not arise naturally from those Texts, but are only his own ungrounded Suppositions, and mistaken Apprehensions.

xii *The Epistle to the Godly Pedo-Baptists.*

Mr. *Owen*, in his Epistle to the *Courteous Wellsmen*, saith;
“ The greatest part of the true Church judg that the Chil-
“ dren of the Faithful have a right to Baptism, because they
“ are in the Covenant of God : This Opinion is agreeable to
“ the Scriptures, as it appears, saith he, in this Book.

Reply. What Covenant is it he means ? Our Children, as
such, are in, I know not, they are not in the Covenant
of Grace ; for if all the Children of the Faithful were
in the Covenant of Grace, they must be all saved :
This I have in this Treatise fully proved, there is none
can fall finally away that are in this Covenant. Besides,
if they were in the Covenant of Grace, why must they
have Baptism administred to them from this foot of Ac-
count, and not the Lord's Supper, and all other Privileges
of the Church ?

2. They are not in the Covenant of Peculiarity God made
with *Abraham's* Natural Seed, as such, or with the whole
House of *Israel* ; for that was a Typical Covenant, and is ta-
ken away.

Mr. *Owen* saith, they are in the outward Dispensation of
the Covenant of Grace.

Rep. Let him prove, if he can, that the Children of Believers
have more Privileges, by the outward Dispensation of the Go-
spel, than the Children of Unbelievers have where the Gospel
is preach'd. Those who lived under the outward Dispensa-
tion of the Law, who believed in Christ to come, or were
elected, were in the Covenant of Grace, and none but they
only ; and so 'tis now, none but the Elect, and such that
believe, are in the Covenant of Grace.

Will Mr. *Owen* seal all New Covenant-Blessings to all his
Natural Seed, whether elected or not elected, since the in-
ward and Spiritual Blessings of the said Covenant, by his own
words, belong only to the Elect ?

“ Mr. *Owen* bids you to seek for a meek and humble, and
“ self-denying Spirit.

Reply. This Counsel is good, therefore be not too confi-
dent you are in the Right ; your Teachers are but Men, and
God may, for some Reasons best known to himself, hide Belie-
vers Baptism at present from them.

“ He bids you also to beware of a distemper'd Zeal, that is
“ not after Knowledg ; it is (saith he) a Wild-Fire that
“ wasteth Churches and Countries, &c.

Reply,

Reply. Such, I fear, hath been that Zeal he and others have shewed for Infant-Baptism : For it will appear, I hope, in this Treatise, that his Zeal is not according to the knowledge of God's Word.

“ Despise not (saith Mr. Owen) thy Faithful Teachers, obey them, and submit to them, for they watch for thy Soul.

Reply. As you ought not to despise your Teachers, but to submit to them in the Lord ; so you ought not to Idolize them, nor follow them any farther than they follow Christ : For you must know, that Men, tho Ministers, are not your Rule of Faith and Practice, but God's Word. Moreover, know that you must give an account of your selves to God, others will not be suffered to speak for you at the Great Day.

“ He bids you look upon little Children, as part of their Natural Parents, and comprehended in the Promise made unto good Parents.

1. *Reply.* This he hath also asserted elsewhere in his Book, which you will find answered in this.

2. Strange ! Are Children part of their Parents, so that when the Parents believe the Children believe, and when the Parents obey God's Command the Children obey it also, and when the Parents have a Promise of Pardon and Peace, the Children have right to the same Promise ? What strange Doctrine is this !

Are not we and our Children distinct Persons ? Shall not a whole Believer be saved ? I profess I cannot well see that it can be so, if any of our Children who are a part of us do perish for ever.

And doth it follow, because in the Covenant of Peculiarity God made with the whole House of *Israel*, the Parents and Children were comprehended, therefore they must be all comprehended in the Covenant of Grace also, and made Members of the Gospel-Church ? He cites Deut. 4. 37, 40. *And because he loved thy Fathers, therefore he chose their Seed after them.* What of this ? Mr. Owen can never prove that God hath chosen any one Nation, both Parents and Children, since that time, to be a peculiar People in a Covenant-Relation with himself, as he chose the Natural Seed of *Abraham* ; it was a Typical Church, and figured forth the true Spiritual Seed or true *Israel* of God : Therefore that Church-State ceased at the Death of Christ, when the Partition-wall was broken down. And the extent of the Promise now, and Gospel-

xiv *The Epistle to the Godly Pedit-Baptists,*

Gospel-Church-Privileges, only runs to Believers and to their Children that are called, or who do believe, whether Jews or Gentiles, *Acts* 2. 29. and to no more.

“ Understand (saith Mr. Owen) the extent of God’s Co-
“ venant with his People; his Covenant is with them and
“ their Seed: This was the Covenant of Grace which God
“ made with Adam, *Gen.* 3. 15. and 4. 25. And the Cove-
“ nant which he made with Noah, *Gen.* 9. 9. with Abraham,
“ *Gen.* 17. 7. with Isaac, *Gen.* 28. 4. and with Jacob, *Gen.*
“ 35. 12. And in the same manner was his Covenant with
“ David and his Seed, *2 Sam.* 7. 12. and 22. 51. in this
“ Eternal Covenant he rejoiced on his Death-Bed, *2 Sam.*
“ 23. 5.

Rep. Here are a heap of words in a confused manner wrap’d up together, without distinguishing one Covenant from another, and without distinguishing between Seed and Seed.

2. If the Covenant of Grace God made with Adam, was also to all his Seed, How happy is the whole VWorld? All are Adam’s Natural Seed. Be sure that was the Covenant of Grace, and the first discovery of it; and this runs only to Christ, the Seed of the VWoman, and to all the Elect in him; not to the Seed of the Serpent who were nevertheless Adam’s Natural Seed, as I shewed you before.

3. God’s Covenant with Noah had Grace in it, and he was in the Covenant of Grace himself; but that Covenant, *Gen.* 9. 9. was also made with all the VWorld, and with the Beasts of the Field, and Fowls of Heaven, *even with every Living Creature.* Yet we will acknowledg thus much, *i. e.* that all Covenants God made with Man since the Fall, originally did spring from his special Love to his Elect, and New Covenant-Grace designed for them; and so they were chiefly for their Sakes: But every distinct Covenant we read of was not material, and formally the Covenant of Grace.

4. The Covenants with Abraham and his Seed, I have proved in this Answer to Mr. Owen, was Twofold, as he was a twofold Father, Head and Representative, and had a twofold Seed. (1.) The Covenant or Free-Promise of Grace God made with him, the Apostle proves was *not made to Seeds, as of many, but to thy Seed, that is Christ,* *Gal.* 3. 16. *If any Man be in Christ, he is one of Abraham’s Seed, and as Heir according to the Promise,* ver. 29. (2.) The Covenant of Peculiarity God made with Abraham and his Seed, we deny not, refers to all his Natur. l Seed, or Fleshly Seed, as such, to which

which Circumcision did appertain: But this will do the *Pedo-Baptists* no service. The Covenant God made with *David* runs primarily to Christ, and in him to all the Elect; this is the Eternal Covenant indeed.

“*Mr. Owen* saith, The Evangelical Prophet foretelleth that the Covenant of Grace should be of the same extent under the Gospel, even as it was from the Beginning, *Isa. 66. 22. For as the new Heavens shall remain before me, so shall your Seed remain.* God’s Covenant with the Seed of the Faithful is so stedfast as the new Heavens and the new Earth.

1. *Reply.* This all Men know only refers to the Elect Seed, and not to the Seed of the Faithful, as such.

2. We deny not but the Covenant of Grace is of the same extent in the Gospel-Days as it was from the Beginning. But from the Beginning none were truly and really in the Covenant of Grace, but the Elect of God only.

But what *Mr. Owen*, in the close of his second Epistle, hath said, may open the Eyes of his Reader, tho his own be shut. Take his words.

“Distinguish between the outward Dispensation of the Covenant and the inward Dispensation thereof, *Rom. 9. 4, 8.* All the Seed of *Abraham* was in the outward Dispensation, and the Seal of the Covenant belonged unto them; but none were in the inward Dispensation, save the Elect only.

Reply. Are not all Men in the VWorld, especially where the Gospel is preached, in or under the outward Dispensation of the Gospel, or Covenant of Grace? Sure none can deny this. But doth Baptism therefore belong to them all? All the Natural Seed of *Abraham* we acknowledg were in the outward Dispensation of the Law, or Covenant of Peculiarity God made with him; and had great external Privileges thereby, which in some things much differed from the Privileges of such who are under the Dispensation of the Gospel: But let them be what they will, the outward Dispensation of the Gospel of Grace, doth belong as far forth to Unbelievers and their Children, as to the Children of Believers: For what is that more than the Privilege of reading and hearing the Gospel preached, or attending on the Word, in Christian Assemblies?

2. I ask *Mr. Owen* how he can prove that the Seal of the Covenant of Grace doth belong to them who are only in the outward Dispensation of the Gospel? This may seem strange

xvi *The Epistle to the Godly Pedo-Baptists.*

to all thinking Men. They whom the Seal of the Covenant of Grace belongeth unto, are assured of all of the peculiar Immunities, Blessings, and Privileges thereof, as pardon of Sin, Justification, Adoption, and Eternal Life.

3. Tho I owth no Seal, or nothing to be a Seal of the Covenant of Grace, save the Holy Spirit; Yet, was Baptism the Seal of it, as Mr. *Owen* supposeth, certainly it must (if it were so) seal to the Person baptized all those Spiritual Blessings or inward Graces signified thereby; or otherwise the Seal would be an insignificant thing, and the Party sealed would but be cheared or deceived: He may think he hath some great Matter sealed to him, when in truth he hath nothing sealed thereby. Pray ask this Man what it is that Baptism seals to Infants?

4. But is it so indeed, Are none in the inward part of the Covenant of Grace, or in the inward Dispensation of the Gospel, but the Elect; then I infer that the Children of the Faithful, as such, are not in the Covenant of Grace, i. e. the Spiritual Blessings or *Faithness* of that Covenant doth not belong to them, as such, but only to such of them as are elected, or who do believe, or are brought under special Vocation by the Holy Spirit. And these things being so, to what purpose is it for this Man, and other *Pedo-Baptists*, to make such a Noise about the Children of Believers, as such, being in the Covenant of Grace? whereas he confesseth none are indeed in it but the Elect. I cannot see it is any thing he and others contend for, in pleading for Infant-Baptism, but only a Christian-Name, or some outward thing, the inward Grace not belonging to any but to the Elect only; and who they are cannot be known till each Person comes to Age, and is called by the Lord: For it is only by effectual Calling that the Election of Persons is known to themselves or others.

But to conclude, Let me add a word or two to you *Pedo-Baptists* that are sound in the Doctrine of Free Grace, and Free Justification by Christ's Righteousness alone.

First, May it not be worth your most serious Thoughts, to consider how the Doctrine of *Pedo-Baptism* is a direct Violation of that Holy Precept of our Blessed Saviour, Mar. 5. 33, 34. *It hath been said of them of old Time, Thou shalt not forswear thy self, but shall perform to the Lord thine Oaths. But I say unto you, swear not at all, &c.* All voluntary and promissory Oaths and Vows, and Religious Covenants, (as well

as vain Swearing) is directly thereby forbid, and therefore sinful. Now tho we grant that the true Baptifmal Covenant is of Divine Institution, yet ſince that only obligeth thoſe that are the true Subjects thereof, viz. Believers: It followeth that that Vow or Covenant you bring your poor Babes under, being wholly without Divine Authority, it is therefore voluntary, and ſo forbid, and ſinful.

Secondly, It is alſo directly repugnant to thoſe Precepts, *Add not to his Word, leſt he reprove thee, &c.*

Thirdly, Conſider that Infants Baptifmal Covenant is alſo directly repugnant to the nature of the Covenant of Grace, rendring the Covenant of Grace to be of the ſame nature of the Covenant of Peculiarity God made with Abraham and his Natural Seed, as ſuch, and ſo ſutes only with the *Baxterian* Errors, and Mr. *William's New Scheme*, which renders the Covenant of Grace conditional, according to the Covenant of Works. Take Mr. *Baxter's* words, viz. "The Condition of the Covenant of Grace, by which we have right to the Benefits of it, is our Faith (mark it) or Chriſtianity, as it is meant by Chriſt in the Baptifmal Covenant, viz. to give up our ſelves in Covenant, believing in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, renouncing the Contraries; and that through this conſent to the Chriſtian Covenant (called Faith alone) is the full condition of our firſt right to the Benefits of that Covenant (of which Juſtification) is one. *Baxter's* Fourth Propoſit. in his Preface to Dr. *Tully*.

1. From hence note, as Mr. *Troughton* obſerves, Mr. *Baxter* doth not ſay that Chriſt's Righteouſneſs, apprehended by Faith, doth juſtify us; but Faith in a comprehensive Senſe, as it includeth Obedience to God, according to this Covenant. It appears that the Belief and Practice of the Chriſtian Religion, upon performance of their Infant Baptifmal-Covenant, is that Righteouſneſs by which they are juſtified, as the purpoſe of Mr. *Baxter's* Senſe.

2. From hence alſo, it appears that the Spring or Riſe of this grand *Baxterian* Error is from Infants-Baptifmal Covenant; therefore, Brethren, 'tis time to conſider the danger of this unwarrantable Practice and evil Innovation.

D. *Williams* confirms Mr. *Baxter's* Notion: Take his words, "What doth the Covenant bind thee to (ſpeaking of Infants Baptifmal-Covenant)? His Answer is, To be the Lord's; in ſincere Care, to know, love, believe, obey, worſhip and ſerve him all my days, and to depend on God, thro Chriſt, for all Happineſs, *Rom. 6. 4.*

xviii The Epistle to the Godly Pedo-Baptists,

Quest. *What if a Child, thro the love of Sin, or vanity of Mind, will not agree to this Covenant?*

I answer, (saith he) "He then rejecteth Christ our Saviour, and renounceth the Blessings of the Gospel.

Quest. *Is it a great Sin to refuse to agree to the Covenant to which thy Baptism engaged thee?*

He answers, "It is the damning Sin, and the Heart of all Sin, Mr. Williams's Book, called *The Vanity of Youth*, pag. 131.

1 Reply. From hence it appears, that Mr. Baxter and Mr. Williams plainly declare that the terms and condition of the Covenant of Grace, which must be performed by such that would be justified, is to perform this Infant Baptismal-Covenant, viz. sincerely to love, believe, obey, worship and serve the Lord; not Faith only whereby we receive Christ, rely on Christ, but the whole of that Obedience to which they were obliged by their Infant-Baptism.

2. Observe also, that it appears according to these Men, that Unbelief is not the condemning Sin, but the non-performance of this Baptismal-Covenant.

3. How are these Men left of God, to darkness of their own Minds, not only to affirm the Conditionality of the Covenant of Grace, rendering it no better than a new Covenant of Works, but also to make this devised and voluntary Infant Baptismal-Covenant to be the only Condition of it, and of our Justification in the sight of God?

4. Moreover, They bring their poor Babes (without any Authority from Christ) under a Covenant, and charge them with Perjury if they break it, when grown up; (if they perform it they shall be pardoned, justified and saved) but they must be damn'd if they answer not the Rule of the Promise, or Baptismal-Covenant, which is to repent, to be regenerated, and so answer their *new Law of Faith and sincere Obedience*: So that in this Covenant lies the Conditionality of their Covenant of Grace. For no other formal Covenant is proposed by them to the People, unless they are for Mr. Joseph Allen's voluntary Covenant, contrived out of his own Head, and proposed to all devout Adult Persons to enter into, which no doubt is forbid by our Saviour as sinful: (he was a well-meaning Man.) And the Truth is, his devised Covenant seems more plausible and reasonable than Infants Baptismal-Covenant, because he would have none but such enter into his Covenant who are Adult Persons; besides, it must be with their own free Consent, whereas Children are brought into theirs, without their knowledg, or consent, and are ob-

liged

liged to do those things which they have no power to perform: And as it is not required by the Lord, so God hath made no Promise to them, of Grace and Assistance, to discharge the Obligation thereof.

Fourthly, To conclude, It is easy to gather from whence their Mistake doth arise about this Baptismal-Covenant, which evidently appears to be from their applying it to false Subjects; (and so to bind such to perform those things which Christ never ordained Baptism to do,) viz. such that are in their Natural State, or who when baptized believed not, nor were capable so to do; for your Brethren the *Pedo-Baptists* tell you that Baptism obligeth such as are baptized to believe, and to become new Creatures, not that they were such that then did believe, &c. And from hence it followeth, that it is one of those Works or Acts of Obedience that go before Faith, and therefore a dead Work, and pleaseth not God (as well as not required of him); for all Works before Faith, or Union with Christ, are dead Works, they not proceeding from a Spiritual Vital Principle.

It therefore appears from hence, that Infant's Baptismal-Covenant is directly also repugnant to Christ's true Baptismal-Covenant: For evident it is, that Christ's Baptism only belongs to Believers who are renewed, regenerated, and have Union with Christ, and so in a justified State before baptized: Our Baptism doth not oblige us to believe and to be regenerated, or to die to Sin, as such that were not dead before; but it is a sign of that Faith and Death unto Sin we had when we were baptized, or to shew that we were then dead to Sin, &c. *How shall we that are dead to Sin, live any longer therein? Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into his Death? Or as being dead with him, Therefore we are buried with him into Death, Rom. 6. 2, 3, 4. Not buried alive or whilst dead in Sin: No, but as being dead to Sin. Not to oblige us to be regenerated, but, as Persons who are regenerated before, buried in Baptism. And the Covenant of Baptism is, to walk in newness of Life, as being before quickned, That like as Christ was raised from the dead by the Glory of the Father, so we should walk in newness of Life.*

I find Mr. Richard Baxter also saith, Baptism is a sign of present Regeneration, not future. Now, how inconsistent is this Infant Baptismal-Covenant to the Covenant of Grace, and also to the nature of that Baptismal-Covenant, Believers, or true justified Persons, enter into when baptized, according

xx *The Epistle to the Godly Pedo-Baptists,*
 to Christ's Institution? Nothing can be more clear than this,
viz. that Infant's Baptismal-Covenant is of the same nature
 with the Covenant of Circumcision, *viz.* a conditional legal
 Covenant, *Do this, and thou shalt live*; perform the Obligation,
 and thou shalt be justified, but do it not, and you shall be
 damned, or be cut off: So that Infant-Baptism established the
 old legal conditional Covenant. Let such who hold the Do-
 ctrine of Free-Grace consider it; and also see whether it
 doth not render the Covenant of Grace different in its nature
 in respect had to Believers themselves, and to their Chil-
 dren: For Believers themselves receive Christ as Sinners, by
 Faith only, without any previous Qualification, or promiss-
 sory Covenant, that Christ hath obliged them to enter into:
 But their Infants are put upon previous conditional Quali-
 fications, which must be performed by them before justified.
 Indeed had Christ ordained Baptism to oblige us to believe,
 to repent, to die to Sin, to be regenerate, as the *Pedo-Baptist*
 speak of their Baptism doth do, it was something to their pur-
 pose, but the contrary plainly appears. Were these things
 carefully considered, I am sure Infant-Baptism would fall to
 the ground; for the nature of their pretended Baptismal Co-
 venant is quite repugnant to the true Baptismal Covenant
 Christ instituted, therefore pernicious: Besides, how are
 those baptized Infants in the Covenant of Grace, (as Mr.
 Owen and others say) and yet Baptism (as to the main De-
 sign and End of it in their cloudy Conceits and Apprehen-
 sions) is to oblige them to believe, &c. that they may actual-
 ly be in the Covenant of Grace. The good Lord give you Un-
 derstanding in all things, and bless to your Profit what I have
 wrote, and praise God for that Readiness that was in your Bre-
 thren and Countrymen to be at the great Charge of the Publi-
 cation of this Answer to Mr. Owen. He saith, in the Title of
 his Book, *Childrens Baptism is from Heaven*. Strange! yet no
 where instituted, nor any Authority for it, or ever owned
 from Heaven; certainly you will find it is of Men, and sprang
 out of the Antichristian Apostacy. Search the Scripture, be
 like the Noble Bereans, Acts 16. 11. *Who with all Readiness of*
Mind received the Truth, and searched the Scriptures daily, whether
those things were so. Brethren, I shall add no more, but commit
 you to God, and intreat you to read this Book over and over
 without Prejudice; and if you receive any Light by it, give
 God the Glory, for I desire to be nothing; yet am willing
 still to serve you, and the Interest of Christ, who shall sub-
 scribe my self your Servant for Jesus Sake,

Southwark, London this 1th of
 the 1th Month 1666

Benj. Keach.

To all Godly *Anti-pedo-baptists*, especially to them in South and North-Wales; the Author of this Treatise wishes Grace, Mercy and Peace from God the Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ.

Beloved in our dear Redeemer,

AT your desire, I have (as the Lord hath helped me) answered Mr. James Owen's Book, in which he hath cast many false and slanderous Reflections on you and all other Anti-Pedo-Baptists; but I have forbore returning Railing for Railing, tho perhaps some of my Words may seem a little too sharp, but his way of Writing called for it: I hope the Translators of his Book first out of Welch into English, and again the Translation of my Answer out of English into Welch is done faithfully, if it be according to the true Sense and Purport of his Words and Meaning; the different placing of Words he can have no ground to cavil at, but of that I am not capable to judge, because I understand not the Welch Tongue.

He seems to reflect very severely upon some of your Conversations, as if you wanted that true Piety that becomes your Holy Profession, and also as if you wanted Charity; but I hope it is his own uncharitable Spirit that led him out thus to write, and that you

xxii *The Epistle to the Godly Anti-Pedo-Baptists,*
are People who rest not on the Form of Godliness,
without the Power, and that you also love all in whom
you see the Image of Christ: The Truth is, he of all
Men might have forborn such a Charge, considering
how short himself appears in that respect, having la-
boured to cast you and all Anti-Pedo-Baptists out of
the Universal Church, and chargeth us who dipp
believing Men and Women in the Name, &c. with
Adultery and Murder. O that the Lord would
open his Eyes and give him true Repentance.

Brethren, this Answer hath swelled much bigger
than you expected, which I am my self troubled at:
But pray pardon me in this case.

Because this Controversy was never before printed
in the Welch Tongue, as I am informed (as it is
here) I was therefore willing the Godly in Wales,
or any of the Antient Britains that desired Infor-
mation herein, might see the main Arguments that
other Pedo-Baptists have brought for Infant-Bap-
tism fully answered: The Substance therefore of
Mr. Burkitt's late Book is in this also answered,
and divers others; nay, there is scarcely an Argu-
ment that hath been brought for Infant-Baptism for-
merly, or of late, but 'tis here answered: Also, I
have, in following Mr. Owen in his Repetitions, been
forced to repeat some things often which may add
to the Bulk; but they being chiefly some of the main
Points, I did it on purpose, to the end they might have
the greater Influence upon the Reader. Moreover, I
have shewed that most of Mr. Owen's Arguments
for the baptizing of Children, send every way as for-
sibly to prove they ought to partake of the Lord's
Supper also; which I desire may be carefully weighed
and considered: I have often repeated that on purpose.

And

And now to conclude, Let me desire you to labour to adorn the Holy Gospel you profess, with a futable and becoming Conversation; 'tis not an External Ordinance that signifies any thing, without true Faith and a Godly Life. You have Lamps, but O see you have Oyl in your Vessels; not that I blame you for your great Zeal for this precious, tho despised Truth of Christ, considering what a Glorious and Illustrious Institution or Blessed Ordinance it is, as appears,

1. By the Obedience of our Blessed Saviour himself unto it, which puts a great Lustre and Glory upon it.

2. In that it is called a fulfilling of that Righteousness which the Holy Gospel calls for; and such who fail herein are imperfect touching their doing the whole Will of God.

3. In that it was so gloriously owned at the Baptism of our Saviour, by the Father, nay by the whole Trinity. By the Father, by a Voice from Heaven: The Son by his actual Obedience to it as our Example, when we believe: The Holy Ghost by descending like a Dove, in a visible manner, and resting upon our Blessed Lord; this was the time when he was gloriously sealed, Mat. 3. 16, 17.

4. In that hereby all baptized Believers do signify their steadfast Faith in the Blessed Trinity, and do devote themselves to serve and worship the Three Persons in the Godhead, Mat. 28. 19, 20.

5. Because it doth so clearly hold forth and confirm us in the steadfast Belief of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and of our Resurrection at the last Day, Rom. 6. 3, 4.

xxiv *The Epistle to the Godly Anti-Pedo-Baptists,*

6. *Also considering the many great and gracious Promises made to such Believers who are baptized, as Mark 16. 16. Acts 2. 37, 38.*

7. *Considering what a significant Ordinance it is, in respect had to that Death to Sin and Vivification to a new Life, in all its true and proper Subjects, together with that Obligation it lays them under, Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 12, 13.*

8. *That it is particularly called the Counsel of God, and such who refused to be baptized, are left on Sacred Record under that black Odium of rejecting the Counsel of God, Luke 7. 30.*

9. *'Tis a great Ordinance, appears in that it is an Initiatory Ordinance into the Visible Church, Acts 2. 41, 42.*

10. *In that those who were baptized with the Holy Spirit, were nevertheless commanded to be baptized with Water, Acts 10. 48.*

The highest Gifts of the Spirit cannot exempt Persons from their Obedience hereunto: Moreover, we have herein also Fellowship with Christ in his Death and Resurrection. Therefore let none rob you of Christ's own Baptism; be not cheated with a listle filthy Dross, of Christ's pure Gold, nor endure to see your Lord's Wine mixt with filthy Puddle-Water: Yet carry it with all Christian Charity, Love and Humility towards all Godly Christians that differ in this Matter from you, and strive to walk as you are obliged by your Holy Baptism to do; then will God have Glory, and you have Peace; to whose Holy Care, Blessing, and Protection, I shall commit you; and remain your unworthy Brother, in the Sacred Bonds of the Gospel,

Benj. Keach.

*A TABLE of divers Authors cited in this
Treatise in each Chapter, and under many
particular Heads.*

First, **T**HAT Baptizing is to dip as to the literal, proper, and genuine Signification of the Greek Word; and asserted so to be by these Authors following, as cited in this Treatise, Chap. 1. chap. 2. chap. 3. chap. 4.

Casaubon, quoted by *Dr. Du Veil* on *Acts*, Chap. 1. ver. 5. pag. 10, 11. cited in this Treatise. Chap. 1. p. 4.

Oecumenius on *Acts* 2. ver. 2. quoted also by *Dr. Du Veil* on *Acts*, p. 11. cited in this Book. Chap. 1. p. 4.

Scapula and *Stephens*; see their *Lexicons* cited in this Treatise. Chap. 3. p. 12.

Grotius,
Pasor,
Vossius, } quoted by *Mr. H. D.* his second Edition of
his Treatise, p. 182.

Mingæus, in his Dictionary.

Dr. Du Veil, in his literal Exposition of the *Acts*, Chap. 1. 4. and his *Exposit.* on *Mat.* 3. 5. *Leigh*, in his *Critica Sacra*; all cited in this Book. Chap. 3. pag. 12.

Bullinger,

Zanchy,
Spanhemius,
Erasmus, } See *Mr. Leigh*; *Critica sacra*: and *Dr. Du Veil*, on *Acts*. cited in this Book, p. 12.

Cajetan upon *Mat.* 3. 5. cited in this Book. Chap. 4. p. 20.

Salmasius in his Book *Deprim*, p. 193. see his Notes upon *Sulpitius Severus*, cited in this Treatise, Chap. 3. p. 13. lin. 1.

Beza on *Matth.* 3. 11. cited in this Book, p. 13.

Selden, *De Jure Nat. &c.* L. 2. c. 2. cited in this Treatise, p. 13.

Ainsworth upon *Levit. Chap. 11. 32.* cited in this Treatise, p. 13. What is cited p. 13, 14. of *Luther the German*, and *John Bugenhagen*, is taken out of *Dr. Du Veil. p. 76.*

Dan. Rogers in his Treatise of Sacraments, *Part 1. Chap. 8. p. 177.* cited in this Treatise, p. 13.

Synod of Celichyth, Anno 816. as quoted by *Dr. Du Veil* on the *Acts Chap. 2. p. 75, 76, 77.* cited in this Book, *Chap. 3. p. 13.*

Dan. Rogers Treatise of the Sacraments, *P. 1. Chap. 5.* cited here, p. 19.

Dr. Jer. Taylor Ductor Dubit. *l. 3. c. 4. Numb. 9. Rule of Conscience. l. 3. c. 4.* cited in this Book, p. 13, 14.

Zepper, quoted by the same Doctor.

Sylvester Squropulus also quoted by *Dr. Du Veil* on *Act. 2.* cited in this Treatise, p. 13.

St. Ambrose, Lib. de Initiandis, and as quoted by *Sir Norton Knatchbul* in his Notes Printed at *Oxon, 1677.* also quoted by *Dr. Du Veil* on *Act. 2. p. 78.*

Muscus on *Matth. 3. 5.* cited here, p. 20.

Luther, Latin Tom. 1. Fol. 71. cited in this Book, *Chap. 3. p. 14.*

John Bugenhagen Pomeranus, as quoted by *Dr. Du Veil*, out of a Book Printed in the *German Tongue*, Printed 1542. cited in this Treatise, p. 14.

Mr. Joseph Mede, *Diatrib. on Titus 3. 2.* cited here *Chap. 3. p. 15.*

Casaubon on *Matth. 3. 11.* cited here in p. 19.

Chamier Pan. Cathol. Tom. 4. l. 5. c. 2. Ser. 6. cited in this Book, p. 15.

Diodate on *Matth. 3.*

Dr. Hammond in his Annot. on *Matth. 3. 10.* cited here, p. 15.

Mr. Pool's Annot. on *Mat. 3. 6. Mat. 28. 2. John 3. 23.* cited in this Book, p. 16.

Mr. Ball in his Catechism, cited here, p. 16.

Dutch Testament, on *Mat. 3. 16.* cited here, p. 16.

Secondly, That Baptism is dipping or burying of the whole Body in Water, to represent the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, and our Death to Sin and Vivification to a new Life. Authors that assert this follow.

Assembly in their Annotations on Rom. 6. 3. 4.

Pool's

- Poole's* Annotations on *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. here cited *Chap.* 5. p. 29, 30.
- Tilenus* in his Disputation, p. 886, 889, 890. all cited in this Book, *Chap.* 4. 5. p. 30, 31.
- Piscator* cited in this Treatise, p. 17.
- Cajetan* upon *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. cited in this Treatise, *Chap.* 5. p. 29, 30.
- Keckerman*, *Syst. Theol.* l. 3. c. 8. cited in this Book, p. 31.
- St. Ambrose,*
Basil the Great,
Basil Seleucia,
Chrysostom,
Lactant.
Bernard,
Justin Martyr,
- All quoted by *Sir Norton Knatchbull*, see his Book cited in this Treatise, p. 35, 36, 37.
- Ignatius* *Epist. ad Tral. id Epist. ad Philadelph.*
- Dr. Cave's* Primitive Christianity, p. 320. cited in this Treatise, p. 22.
- Dallie* on the Fathers, L. 2. p. 148. cited in this Book, p. 32.
- Paræus* upon *Ursin*, p. 375. cited in this Treatise, p. 33.
- Mr. Perkins* on *Galat.* Vol. 2. chap. 3. p. 257. Vol. 1. chap. 33. p. 74.
- Dr. Sharp*, present Archbishop of *York*, see his Sermon on *Phil.* 3. 10. p. 9.
- Dr. Fowler*, present Lord Bishop of *Gloucester*, in his Book, *Design of Christianity*, p. 90.
- Dr. Sherlock*, Dean of *Paul's*, *Charity without Usury*, p. 1. cited here, p. 38, 39.
- Dr. Tillotson*, late Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in his Book, *Sermons on several Occasions*, the fifth Edition, p. 188, 189. cited here, p. 39.
- Anonymous French Author, cited by *Dr. DuVail* on *Acts*, p. 292, 293.
- Calvin*, L. 4. c. 16. cited in this Book, *Chap.* 5. p. 41.
- Zanchy* on *Col.* 2. 12. cited in this Book, *Chap.* 5. p. 41.

Thirdly, *Baptism is Dipping*, according to the purport of those Typical Baptisms spoken of in the Scripture. Authors thus assert this.

Sir Norton Knatchbull, see the quotations before cited, upon this account, in this Book, p. 43.

Pool's Annotations on *I Cor.* 10. 1, 2, 3.

Thomas Aquinas, as quoted by *Dr. Du Veil*, cited here, p. 35.

Fourthly, *Baptism is Dipping of the whole Body in Water*, according to the purport of those *Metaphorical Baptisms* spoken of in the *Scripture*. Authors that assert this, mentioned in this *Treatise*.

Casaubon, as quoted by *Dr. Du Veil*, on *Act.* 1. 5. p. 10. cited in this *Treatise*, p. 44.

Oecumenius on *Act.* 2. cited here, p. 44.

Vossius.

Pool's Annotations on *Matth.* 20. 22. both cited in this Book, p. 44.

In Chapter 8. concerning *Christ's Commission*, two Authors are mentioned, p. 97, 98.

Mr. Perkins on *Gal. Vol.* 2. Chap. 3. p. 25.

Mr. Baxter's Right of Baptism, p. 149, 150.

In Chap. 9. p. 119, &c. You have an account of the Authors who Assert that the Holiness mentioned *I Cor.* 7. 14. is *Matrimonial Holiness*.

Jerom.

Chameri, Sect. 50. Sic *Ambrosius Thomas*.

Anselmus.

Snarez.

Melancthon in his *Commentary* upon this place of *Scripture*, viz. *I Cor.* 7. 14.

Camerarius.

Musculus, in his *Comment* on *I Cor.* 7. 14.

Camera.

Erasmus upon the place, viz. *I Cor.* 7. 14.

THE
T A B L E
OF THE
C H I E F H E A D S.

C H A P. I.

Remarks on Mr. Owen's first Chapter, shewing his abuse of the Text Heb. 9. 19 opening the proper Signification of the Greek word Baptizo Page 1. to 5

C H A P. II.

Mr. Owen's Argument for the Continuation of Baptism, turned against his Infant Baptism Page 5. to 9

C H A P. III.

Proving Baptism is Immersion, or Baptizing is Dipping, from the proper signification of the Greek word Page 9. to 16

C H A P. IV.

Proving Baptizing is Dipping, from the Practice of John Baptist, Christ and his Apostles Page 17. to 29

C H A P. V.

Proving Baptizing is dipping the whole Body in Water, from the signification of Baptism Page 20. to 44

C H A P. VI.

Mr Owen's Argument for Infant Baptism, from the Covenant God made with Abraham, answered Page 45. to 79

C H A P. VII.

Mr. Owen's Arguments to prove Infant Baptism from Circumcision, answered Page 80. to 96

C H A P.

xxx The Table of the Chief Heads.

CH A P. VIII.

Mr. Owen's Argument taken from Christ's Commission, Math. 28. 19, 20. answered Page 96. to 108

CH A P. IX.

Proving the holiness spoken 1 Cor. 7. 14. Else were your children unclean; but now they are holy: is not Federal or Spiritual holiness, but the holiness of Legitimative or Matrimonial holiness Page 109. to 129

CH A P. X.

Opening the purport of that Text of Christ's Blessing little Children, in answer to Mr. Owen's Argument taken from thence for Infant Baptism Page 125. to 134

CH A P. XI.

Opening the nature of that holiness, Rom. 11. 16. If the root be holy, so are the branches, and Mr. Owen's Argument for Infant Baptism from thence, answered, Page 134. to 147

CH A P. XII.

In answer to Mr. Owen's 10th. Chapter and his Argument, that Children can partake of those things prefigured in Baptism, Page 147. to 154

CH A P. XIII.

In answer to Mr. Owen's Arguments for Infant Baptism, from those Typical Baptisms under the Law or Old Testament, Page 154. to 170

CH A P. XIV.

In answer to Mr. Owen's Argument for Infant Baptism, from John Baptist's Baptizing (all the people of the Jews as he asserteth) Page 171. to 188

CH A P. XVI.

In answer to Mr. Owen's 13th. Chap. concerning those whole households said to be Baptized in the New Testament, P. 189. to 213

CH A P. XVII.

In answer to Mr. Owen's 14th. Chapter about the Baptism of Infants in the first Centuries after the Apostles, proving no Infants Baptized in the two first Centuries Page 214. to 227

CH A P. XVIII.

Proving Infant Baptism no excellent way to Plant the Christian Religion, in answer to Mr. Owen's 15th. Chapter; shewing it was only contrived to uphold National Churches, and so a sinful practice Page 228. to 239

CH A P.

The Table of the Chief Heads. xxxi

CHAP. XIX.

In which those Objections Mr. Owen mentioned against Infant Baptism, as brought by us, are considered; with a Reply to his Answers Page 234. to 237

CHAP. XX.

In answer to Mr. Owen's Slanders and Reproaches cast upon the Antipedobaptists, proving Dipping Believers in Christ's name does not render us guilty of Murther and Adultery: and Infant Baptism further proved a very sinful practice, P.238. to 262

CHAP. XXI.

Shewing that there is no Blessing to be expected in Infant Baptism; with an answer to Mr. Burket, and Mr. Daniel Williams, in his Book called Vanity of Youth, P.263. to 276

CHAP. XXII.

In Answer to Mr. James Owen's 18th Chapter, wherein he sheweth the Duty of Parents to their Children, proving, in opposition to what he says, that Parents ought not to consecrate their Infants to the Lord by Baptism. Page 276 to 280

CHAP. XXIII.

In answer to Mr. James Owen's 19th Chapter, wherein he gives advice to Children, with an answer to his Queries, that he would have the Anti-pedobaptists to reply unto Page 280 to 293

CHAP. XXIV.

Containing some practical Use of the whole Treatise, with Seasonable Counsel to Parents Page 293 to 298

CHAP. XXV.

Containing several Queries for Mr. James Owen to answer Page 298 to 305

CHAP. XXVI.

Containing divers Arguments to disprove Pede-baptism, and to prove the Baptism of Believers; which Mr. Owen is desired to answer when he writes again. Page 305 to the end.

By reason this Treatise was printed at several Presses, the Author could not attend them; whereby many Faults have escaped, and Mispointings, which spoils the Sense.

ERRATA.

PAge 7. Line 27. add, in all that live. P. 12. l. 23. for of way, read way of. P. 13. l. 26. for pag. 5, 6, 7. read pag. 75, 76, 27. being Citations out of Dr. Du Veil. P. 16. l. 5. for John read Matthew. P. 34. l. 10. for and read but. P. 31. l. 3. for almost all read many. P. 45. Chap. 5. read Chap. 6. P. 46. l. 37. read his Natural Seed. P. 48. l. 17. add as such, i. e. his Spiritual Seed as such. P. 5. l. 2. blot out all. P. 30. l. 20. for many read any. P. 51. l. 9. and 15. for a Covenant read the Covenant. P. 51. l. 11. read the Infant-Seed of believing Gentiles as such. P. 51. l. 22. for a Covenant read the Covenant. P. 51. l. 41. for 1st. read 2d. P. 52. l. 41. for a Covenant read the Covenant. P. 53. l. 39. read Gospel-Church and Covenant, and so l. 40. P. 54. l. 16. for a Covenant read the Covenant. Note, If in any other place you find a Covenant read the Covenant. P. 56. l. 43. for Preservation read Perseverance. P. 57. l. 28. blot out it was a sign of. for pag. 56. read 59. P. 59. l. 9. for Land read Law. P. 61. l. 3. blot out for. P. 62. l. 37. blot out now. P. 63. for this is read is this. P. 65. l. 3. blot out all, and for Churches read Church. P. 67. l. 40. for and read but. P. 68. read are not straiter. P. 73. l. 33. for has read hath. P. 75. l. 28. for theirs read the. P. 75. l. 29. for their read the. P. 77. l. 17. (i. e. as such) should be in a Parenthesis. P. 84. l. 3. blot out any. P. 86. in the Contents of Chap. vii. for first read fifth. P. 88. l. 3. blot out from. P. 99. for with the Gentiles read and their Children. P. 89. l. 31. for same read thing. P. 105. l. 37. for pai read pain. P. 112. l. 28. for and read but. P. 117. l. 19. for with read without. P. 118. l. 3. for Mat. read Mal. P. 120. l. 20. blot out so, read and since, &c. P. 201. l. 40. for he that believes shall not be damned, read he that believeth not shall be damned. P. 250. l. 15. for vers. 34. read 3, 4. P. 264. l. 2. for born in Sin, read born again. P. 264. l. 4. blot out do. P. 266. l. 40. for Christian read Children. P. 239. l. 33. for Lord read Lords. P. 293. l. 21. read an external Rite.

C H A P. I.

In answer to what Mr. Owen hath said in his first Chapter.

S I R,

AS to what you say about the Tree of Life, and Tree of Knowledge, that they were Seals of the two Covenants, viz. of the Covenant of Works, and of the Covenant of Grace, or free Promise of God, it is far fetch'd and very doubtful, and as little to the Purpose for which you mention them; therefore I shall pass that by.

2dly. As touching Circumcision being a dark Shadow of the Old Covenant under the Old Dispensation, it may be granted; but that it was the Seal of the Covenant of Grace (which you affirm elsewhere in your Book) I do deny, it being only a Seal of Abraham's Faith, even of that Faith he had, being yet Uncircumcised, and also that he should be the Father of all that should believe.

3dly. You say well that those dark Shadows, viz. Circumcision, &c. are abolished; the Substance being come, that Yoke of Bondage is taken away: which proves Circumcision did not appertain to the Covenant of Grace, as the Seal of it, in common to all Believers; for the breaking off of a Seal cancels the Covenant to which it was prefixed, as all Men know: So that nothing can be more clear than this, that Circumcision, if it was a Seal of any Covenant, (as you conceive it was) it was a Seal of the Covenant of Works, which neither our Fathers nor we were able to bear, in regard it obliged all that were circumcised to keep perfectly the whole Law, Gal. 5. 3.

4thly. You say, 'Christ hath ordained in the Gospel a light and easy Burden, viz. Baptism, and the Lord's Supper. These two are the only Sacraments, you say, of the Gospel. This is granted and owned, herein we do not differ.

5thly. You say, Baptism signifieth our Spiritual Birth, the Lord's Supper our Spiritual Growth and Nourishment. This we

grant also, and therefore we say Baptism cannot belong to Infants, because they are not in an ordinary way capable of Regeneration (tho we deny not that those elect Infants that die, are renewed *quoad illorum naturas*, but we know not which they are; if we did, yet we ought not to baptize them, because we have no Precept or Precedent so to do: we might therefore as well and by as good Authority, give them the Lord's Supper as Baptism, which the ancient Fathers, when first Pædo-baptism was, by Human Authority, introduced into the Church (you know) did for near four hundred Years, till the latter end of the Sixth Century.)

6thly. You say, 'Baptism, according to the Signification of the Word, is Washing; and therefore the Apostle saith, saved us by the washing of Regeneration, Tit. 3. 5. βαπτισμοῖς is rendered, in Heb. 9. 10. in divers Baptisms, those were not only by dipping under Water, but by sprinkling Water on those baptized, as the Apostle teacheth Heb. 9. 19. he took the Blood of the Calves, and of Goats, with Water, and sprinkled the Book and all the People. That which the Apostle (you say) called Baptism in Ver. 10. is in this Verse called the Sprinkling of Water, &c.

Answer. 1. I answer, tho the Word βαπτισμῶν, in a remote Sense, doth take in Washing, yet I challenge you and all that know (or pretend to know) the Greek Tongue, whether in every place in the New Testament where the Word is mentioned, or any Derivative from it, (as it refers to Christ's Ordinance of Baptism) it doth not directly and properly signify Immersion, and accordingly rendred by Beza in his Translation.

2dly. You greatly wrong that Text, Heb. 9. 19. where the Apostle speaks of sprinkling the Blood of Calves, and of Goats with Water, &c. by saying he refers to Ver. 10. where the Apostle speaks of Divers Washings; and in thus doing, you do not only abuse the Sacred Text, but you wrong your own Soul and Conscience; and the People also. Sir, do you find the Greek Word βαπτισμοῖς (which is in ver. 10.) in ver. 19. where sprinkling is mentioned? or is it not in ver. 13, 19. as also 1 Pet. 1. 2. καὶ πάντα τὰ λαὸν ἐρρᾶντο? We may modestly affirm that no Greek Author, whether Heathenish or Christian, has ever put Baptizing for Sprinkling, or used those Words promiscuously; for as in these Scriptures you have cited, Heb. 9. 13, 19, 21. 'tis always translated Sprinkling, so there is not one place in Scripture wherein

wherein the Word βαπτίζω is rendred Baptism, nor is there one Scripture where παρτίζω is rendred Sprinkling. And therefore, tho sometimes the Greek Word doth signify in a remote Sense, Washing, yet 'tis primarily such a washing as is by dipping or plunging, as I said before: And thus Mr. Wilson, in his Dictionary, renders βαπτίζω a βάπτω, tingo, &c. to dip or plunge into the Water; and signifies, saith he, primarily such a washing as is used in Bucks, where Linen is plunged or dipped; tho in a remote Sense, he hints, it signifies other kind of washing; but it does not so in the Holy Scripture where the Word is used, as referring to Christ's Ordinance of Baptizing.

3dly. You say, 'Water-Baptism, i. e. the Washing of the Flesh, signifies the Washing of the Spirit, and therefore the Apostle Peter saith, Even Baptism doth now save us, not the putting away the Filth of the Flesh, but the answer of a good Conscience towards God, by the Resurrection of Christ.

Answer. I answer, you confound Regeneration with Baptism; the washing of Regeneration is not the washing of Baptism: Baptism regenerates no Person. But you seem to follow the ancient erroneous Fathers who concluded no Person could be saved unless baptized, abusing that Text *Joh. 3. 5. Unless a Man be born again of Water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven*; taking Water there for Baptism. In like sort they abused that Text *John 6. 53. Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, ye have no Life in you*; and from thence they gave Infants the Lord's Supper also.

But suppose that Baptism doth signify, or is a figure of the washing of Regeneration, yet sprinkling is no form of washing; but all know dipping is, and the safest way of washing.

2dly. You mention Fiery Baptism, or 'the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, and Fire, *Mat. 3. 11.* This Scripture, you say, was fulfilled when the Holy Ghost came upon the Disciples in the appearance of Fiery Tongues, *Acts 2. 3.* This Baptism was not (say you) by plunging in Fire, but by sprinkling or pouring of Fire (you mean the Holy Spirit) upon them, which sate upon each of them; which is a Fiery washing which purifieth the Soul, &c.

I answer, Tho the Baptism of the Spirit was by pouring forth of the Spirit, yet they were overwhelmed, or immer-

sed with it; like as Dust may be poured upon a dead Corps, until it is covered all over, or quite buried therein: So the Baptism of the Holy Ghost, at the Day of *Pentecost*, signifies the miraculous Effusion of the Holy Ghost. The Greek Word βαπτίζω, saith the Learned *Casaubon*, is to dip, plunge, &c. in which sense, saith he, the Apostles might be truly said to have been baptized, for the House in which this was done was filled with the Holy Ghost; so that the Apostles might seem to have been plunged into it, as in a large Fish-Pond. Sir, 'tis not the sprinkling of the Spirit that is the Baptism of the Spirit, for they had doubtless some sprinklings of the Spirit before they were baptized with it. Moreover, *Oecumenius* on *Acts* 2. saith, *A Wind filled the whole House that it seemed like a Fish-pond, because 'twas promised to the Apostles that they should be baptized with the Holy Spirit.* Thus you may see, that this no ways helps you to make Sprinkling, or Rantizing, Baptism.

3dly. You mention the Baptism of Blood, or Sufferings: I will repeat your Words, — ‘Baptism of Blood; of this Baptism doth Christ ask the Children of *Zebedee*, Are you able to drink of the Cup that I drink of, and to be baptized with the Baptism that I am baptized with? *Mat.* 20. 22. This Cup and this Baptism are the same, viz. the Sufferings of Christ, of which his Disciples were to be Partakers.

You intimate that Baptism is a Witness of our Spiritual Resurrection, and of our Resurrection at the last Day; you mention *1 Cor.* 15. 29, &c.

Ans. Therefore, say I, it must be so administred, as it may represent our Rising again: First, from a Death in Sin to a Life in Grace: And, Secondly, from the Dead, or out of our Graves in the Earth, at the last Day: But Sprinkling doth not this, cannot do this. In sprinkling a little Water on the Face, there is no resemblance or representation of rising up out of the Grave of Sin, or from the Dead, nor out of the Grave at the last Day; the Baptism of Sufferings signifies great Afflictions, and from the Literal Signification of βαπτίζω, great Afflictions or Troubles are taken for, and figurately called Baptism, as *Vossius* shews: Not every light Affliction is the Baptism of Afflictions; but like that of *David*, *Psal.* 32. 6. *He drew me out of deep Waters.* Hence great Afflictions are called Waves, *Thy Waves and thy Billows are gone over me, Psal.* 42. 7. See *Pool's* Annotations on *Mat.* 20. 22. *To be baptized is, saith he, to be dipped in water,*

Meta-

Metaphorically to be plunged in Afflictions. So that neither of these Metaphorical Baptisms will do you any Service, to justify your Tradition of sprinkling, or pouring a little Water, but contrariwise quite overthrows your pretended Baptism. As to what you say, in the next place, of your three manner of ways of the Administration of Baptism in your first Chapter, it doth not concern our present Purpose; 'tis true, *John the Baptist* baptized into him that was to come, so in that respect it differ'd from the Administration of it after the Death and Resurrection of our blessed Lord: and no doubt from the Commission it appears Baptism was to be administred to the end of the World into the Name of the Father, Son, and holy Spirit, and no other ways.

C H A P II.

Containing some Remarks upon Mr. Owen's second Chapter.

AS to what you have wrote in your second Chapter, about the Continuation of Water-Baptism in the Church until Christ's coming the second time, or to the end of the World; I approve generally of your Arguments, and in that matter we are of your mind, tho much more might be added to confirm that great Truth: but pray, Sir, remember, 'tis Christ's *Baptism of Believers*, which he only instituted, that doth remain, not *Infants Baptism*, much less *Infants Rantism*, which was neither instituted nor allowed by our blessed Lord. And because some of your Arguments for the Continuation of Baptism, mentioned in your *second Chapter*, tend to overthrow your *Infant Baptism*, I shall make some Remarks upon them.

They are taken from your *4th Proof*, you argue thus, *viz.*
 " Water-Baptism is to continue in the Church, if we consider the Ends of it.

" I. You say Christ hath ordained Baptism to be a Sign of our Repentance, and therefore 'tis called the Baptism of our Repentance, *Mark* 1. 4. Repentance is a remaining Duty, therefore the Baptism of Repentance is to remain.

Remark. If Baptism be a sign of Repentance to the Person baptized, then the Person baptized ought to be a Person capable to repent, and when baptized, to have what is signified therein: but Infants as such have not the Grace of Repentance when baptized, so they are not capable to repent.

2dly. You say, " It is an Evidence of our Faith in Christ, *Mark* 16. 16. *Acts* 8. 37, 38. and therefore it is to remain as long as Faith is to remain on the Earth.

Remark. If Baptism is an Evidence of our Faith in Christ, then it must only belong to Believers. How can it be an Evidence of Faith in Infants who are not capable to believe? they know not the Object of Faith, nor can they exert any Act of Faith. It must be an Evidence to the Subject when baptized, and so the Scriptures you cite hold forth: *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved, Mark* 16. 16. it doth not say, he that is baptized and believeth. *If thou believest with all thy Heart thou mayst:* Not if thou shalt believe hereafter, but if thou dost believe now. It appertains to such who have Faith when baptized, and it evidences such a Faith to the Person; nay Faith is required of them before they are to be baptized. And so saith the Church of *England*.

3dly. You say, " It is the Bond of Holiness, *1 Pet.* 3. 21. the Apostle exhorts the Christians to be dead unto Sin, and alive unto Righteousness. There is a Virtue in the Ordinances of God answerable to the End for which they are ordained, &c.

Remark. Still, Reader, know that it is a Bond to the Adult only, Infants are not able to die to Sin, nor live unto Holiness: They cannot answer a good Conscience by the Resurrection of Christ from the dead. Ordinances have no more Virtue in them to an Infant, than if you should water a dead Tree. There can be no increase in Holiness without the Grace of Holiness in the Habit be first infused; and if the Seed of Holiness be [first] infused in Infants before Baptism, or in Baptism, that Seed would remain in them, and appear as soon as they come to Understanding, *1 Joh.* 3. 9. But that any such Seed or vital Principle is either way in Infants as such, whether Infants of Believers, or others, appears not; but contrary-wise, nothing appears in them when grown up, but the cursed Seed of Sin, and so it will until their Natures be changed by Divine Grace.

4thly. You

4thly. You say, "Baptism is a sign of Union with Christ, we were baptized into him: For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ; Gal. 3. 27. Again, the Apostle saith, We are all baptized into one Body, 1 Cor. 12. 13. Christ is the Head of the Body, the Faithful are the Members, those that are in everlasting Union with him, which is signified in Baptism: Can they desire to be in one Body with Christ, who are not willing to be baptized into this Union?"

Remark. Have Infants, as such, Union with Christ? If they have, they would all partake of the Blessings of that Union, and be all saved, because the Branch that is savingly united to the Vine Christ, partakes of the Virtue that is in him; and it is an indissoluble Union, like that between the Father and the Son, John 17. 21, 23. You say the Union is everlasting, and this is signified in Baptism. Now what is the Sign without the Thing signified? Sir, no doubt elect Infants that die have Union with Christ in a way we are ignorant of, but what is this to the Infants of Believers as such? I will appeal to your own Conscience, whether you believe any one Infant you baptize, (or rather rantize, or sprinkle) that lives, hath spiritual Union with Christ, before, or in Baptism, or Rantism; for if they had, they do not after they are grown up need any inspired Habit, or the Seed of Grace to be infused into them, in order to such Union. Without Faith there is no Union with Christ, and there can be no Faith without Knowledge; there is no spiritual Marriage to Christ without a Consent, which Infants are not capable of. Moreover, why do you speak of Persons being not willing to be baptized, when the Subject of Baptism you contend for is a poor ignorant Babe? Can Infants be willing? Sir, what you speak has weight in it to the Adult, to Believers, but signifies nothing for the Continuation of Baptism to Infants, but rather that it ought to be rejected, as not being of God.

5thly. You say, "Baptism signifies Remission of Sins, Mark 1. 4. Be baptized every one of you (saith Peter) in the Name of Jesus Christ for the Remission of Sins. So Ananias said unto Paul, Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy Sins, calling upon the Name of the Lord; Acts 22. 16. And are not they, say you, unthankful to the Grace of God, which offereth them a Seal of Absolution, and they will not receive it? &c.

Remark. Baptism is a sign of Remission of Sin to none but Believers, who have Repentance : and therefore *Peter* exhorted those Jews, first to repent ; *Repent, and be baptized every one of you in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins.* Such only here have the Promise of Remission that do and can repent, and to such only ought the Sign to be given, who have the Thing signified, which are not Infants but Believers. Is Absolution and the Seal of it offered unto Infants, and do they refuse to receive it ? Sir, were your Eyes open'd you would soon see you apply all you say to the wrong Subjects. You exhort the Subjects of Baptism to be thankful, lest they despise the Seal of Pardon. Now take from your Reasoning this following Argument, viz. Such Persons that Baptism belongs unto, may neglect and despise the Ordinance and Seal of Pardon ; but Infants cannot neglect or despise the Ordinance and Seal of Pardon : *Ergo*, Baptism doth not belong to Infants.

6thly. " Baptism is, you say, a Condition of the Promise of Salvation ; *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved* ; Mark 16. 16. 'Tis true, say you, the Promise is not only to Baptism, nor is it also to Faith only, but to Faith and Baptism. Dost thou not desire to be saved ? Why then despisest thou one of the *Means* of Salvation ? Thou sayst, if I believe I shall be saved, tho not baptized with Water ; Christ saith otherwise, that thou must believe and be baptized, if thou wilt be saved : 'Tis true, the Apostle saith to the Goaler, *Believe on the Lord Jesus, and thou shalt be saved*, Acts 16. 31, 32. but so soon as he believed, he was baptized. The Unbelief and Haughtiness of thy Heart maketh thee to reject this holy Ordinance, &c.

Remark. How can you make Baptism a Condition of Salvation to Infants who are no ways capable to answer it ? neither Faith nor Baptism is required of them, nor are their Parents commanded to baptize them : But 'tis true, such as believe, are required to be baptized ; and such as reject it, and will not be baptized, tho the proper Subjects, do reject the Counsel of God, and may endanger their Salvation ; or at least it calls into question (if convinced of it, i. e. that it is their Duty) the truth of their Grace, that they neither unfeignedly believe in, nor love Jesus Christ : therefore (Sir) so soon as a Child is grown up and doth believe, he should be baptized, not before ; for we have a perfect Rule to walk by.

Arg. 2. Where there is no Law, there is no Transgression: But there is no Law to baptize Infants: *Ergo*, It is no Transgression not to baptize them.

Where God hath no Mouth to speak, we should have no Ear to hear.

Arg. 3. To act in the Service of God without Authority from his Word, is a Sin:

But they that baptize Infants do act in the Service of God without Authority from his Word: *Ergo*, It is a Sin to baptize Infants.

Would not *Abraham* have sinned if he had circumcised his Females, or to have circumcised his Males on the 7th or 9th day, because the express Command was to Males, and on the eighth day? so the express Command of Christ is, to be baptized *when made Disciples, if we believe, if we repent, or when we believe*, and bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance. You add, " That they that despise Water-Baptism, despise not *John's* Baptism, but the Baptism of " Christ, therefore their Sin is the greater.

Remark. But they that despise and slight the Baptism of Infants, despise neither the Baptism of *John* nor Christ; because neither *John* nor our blessed Saviour commanded Infants to be baptized, nor did they ever baptize one Child as we read of; if you can prove they did do it, we will say no more, but will soon baptize our Children. Thus I have done with all I thought necessary to remark, or take notice of that is contained in your second Chapter.

C H A P. III.

Shewing Baptizing is Dipping, not sprinkling nor pouring a little Water.

S I R,

AS to what is contain'd in the second Chapter of your Book concerning the Continuation of Christ's Baptism of Water in the Church, I shall say no more to that, in that we agree, and are one: but we differ about what Baptism of Water is; you would have it to be Sprinkling, which

which indeed is not Baptism but *Rantism*, for that you know is the Greek Word for Sprinkling.

2. As also we differ about the true and proper Subjects of it, according to our Saviour's Institution; and since you begin with that you call the Manner or external Form of Administration of Baptism, I shall follow you herein, and shall first repeat your Words, and then reply. Thus you begin, *viz.*

" Some judg that the whole Body ought to be dipped in Water, and all other ways to be unlawful.

" Others judg (say you) the sprinkling of Water on the Face of him that is baptiz'd to be sufficient, especially in these cold Climates; for even as in the other Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper there is one Morsel of Bread, and one Spoonful of Wine sufficient for to signify the Spiritual Food that is had in Christ; even so in the Sacrament of Baptism, the sprinkling of a little Water on him that is baptized, signifies the Virtue of the Blood of Christ as effectually as Rivers of Water.

I answer; Certainly you cannot be ignorant of what many learned Pedo-baptists have said in Opposition to what you here speak; for tho both the holy Sacraments are very significant of Christ's Sufferings, and of those spiritual Benefits we receive from him, yet they are of different Signification.

First; The Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper holds forth in a lively Figure, the breaking of Christ's Body, and the pouring forth of his precious Blood; and this indeed may as well be represented by a small quantity of Bread and Wine as by much, yet a little Water will not serve in Baptism.

1. Because 'tis positively said, that *John was baptizing in Enon near Salim, (John 3. 23.) because there was much Water there.* Certainly the Holy Ghost would not have given this as the Reason why *John* baptized near *Enon*, *viz.* because there was much Water in that place, if a little Water, namely a Spoonful or two, would have been sufficient, or two or three Quarts: It seems plainly deducible from this Text, it cannot be administred with a little Water, but contrariwise it doth require much Water.

Secondly; Pray consider, that, as the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper holds forth, or represents (symbolically) the breaking of the Body of Christ, and the shedding of his Blood, (and to that purpose it was in part instituted) even

even so the Sacrament of Baptism holds forth in as lively Figure, that our blessed Lord was dead, buried, and rose again; and to this end this holy Ordinance was also instituted, as also to shew forth our Death unto Sin, and Vivification to Newness of Life, as by and by shall be abundantly proved, both from the holy Scriptures, and a multitude of learned Men that hold Infant-Baptism: therefore since a little Water cannot in this Ordinance represent Christ's Burial and Resurrection, it follows directly that a little Water will not serve to baptize Persons in, but that it must be administred in Rivers, Ponds, or places where there is much Water, *i. e.* so much Water as that the Body may be buried or covered all over therein. But to proceed, you say, "Neither is dipping or sprinkling essential unto this Ordinance, but washing with Water, or putting Water on the Body; for the word *Baptism* signifies in the Greek washing with Water, as we cited (say you) from *Heb. 9. 10.*"

Ans. I answer, now you have given away your Cause at once (or I am mistaken); for if neither dipping nor sprinkling be essential unto this Ordinance, but washing, what is become of your Baptism? Sir, all dipping in Water is washing, tho all washing is not dipping; in that you hurt us not, but your sprinkling is not washing. If a Woman should sprinkle her foul Linen with a few drops of Water, would that be deem'd a washing of them? Again, if Sprinkling be not essential to Baptism, you have no Baptism at all; take away the Body of a Tree, and there is no Tree. That thing can't be where the essential part of it is wanting. And now that the Greek Word *βαπτίζω* doth signify dipping, and such a washing as is by dipping, we shall plainly shew, evince, and demonstrate, and confirm it by such Arguments and Authors that no unprejudiced sober Person can any longer well remain doubtful about this matter, and then we will examine your Objections.

I shall prove baptizing, or *βαπτίζω*, is not sprinkling, nor pouring of Water upon the Body, but dipping or plunging the Body all over in Water: and that,

1st. From the proper, *literal* and *direct* Signification of the Greek Word *Baptizo*, and the Testimonies of Learned Men.

2^{dly}. From the Practice of *Primitive Times*.

3^{dly}. From

3dly. From the Consideration of what is *signified* and *represented* in *Baptism*.

4thly. From those *Typical Baptisms* spoken of in the *Scriptures*.

5thly. From the nature of those *Metaphorical Baptisms* mentioned, *viz.* the *Baptism of the Spirit*, and that of *Afflictions*.

To proceed to prove the first:

Scapula and *Stephens*, two as great Masters of the Greek Tongue as most we have, do tell you in their *Lexicons*, that βαπτίζω baptizo, from βαπτω bapto, signifies *mergo, immergo, item tingo quod fit immergendo, inficere, imbuerere, viz.* to dip, plunge, overwhelm, put under, cover over, to dye in Colour, which is done by plunging.

Grotius says it signifies to dip over Head and Ears.

Pasor, an *Immersion*, dipping or *Submersion*.

Vossius says it implies a *washing the whole Body*.

Mincæus in his *Dictionary* saith that βαπτισμός δ βαπτίζω, is in the Latin *Baptismus*, in Dutch *Doopsit* or *Doopen*, *Baptismus* or *Baptism*, to dive or duck in Water, and the same with the Hebrew טָבַל *Tabal*, which the *Septuagint*, or *Seventy Interpreters* render βαπτίζω baptizo, to dip. This *Casaubon* saith was the right of way Baptizing, that Persons were plunged into the Water, which the very word *Baptizo* sufficiently demonstrates, which as it does not extend so far as to sink down to the bottom to the hurt of the Person, so it is not to swim upon the Superficies of the Water. *Baptism* ought to be administered by plunging the whole Body into the Water.

The late famous, and most learned in all the Oriental Tongues, *Dr. Du-Veil*, in his literal Explanation of the *Acts*, Chap. 1. 5. saith the word βαπτίζω baptizo, is to dip, as if it were to dye Colours; and any Dyer will tell you if there is any small bit of Cloth not dipped, it is not dyed.

Leigh in his *Critica Sacra*, saith, the native and proper Signification of the word is to dip into the Water, or plunge under Water; *Mat.* 3. 6. *Acts* 8. 38. for which also he quotes *Casaubon*, *Bullinger*, *Zanchy*, *Spanhemius*: he saith withal that some would have it signify washing, which Sense *Erasmus*, he saith, opposed, affirming that it was not otherwise so than by Consequence; for the proper Signification was such a dipping or plunging as Dyers use for dying of Cloth.

Salma-

Salmasius saith, That is not Baptism which they give to Children, but Rantism.

Beza on *Mat. 3. 11.* saith the word βαπτίζω baptizo, signifies to dye by dipping or washing.

Selden saith that the Jews took that Baptism wherein the whole Body was not baptized; to be void.

Ainsworth speaks to the same purpose, as I shall shew you.

Mr. *Daniel Rogers* says, that a Minister is to dip in Water the Party baptized, as the meeest Act, the word *Baptizo* notes it; for, saith he, the *Greeks* wanted not words to expresse any other Act besides dipping, if the Institution could bear it: What Resemblance of the Burial and Resurrection of Christ is in sprinkling? [mark that!] all Antiquity and Scripture (saith he) confirms that it was dipping.

If you would, saith *Dr. Du-Veil*, attend to the proper Signification of the word; in the Synod of *Celichyth*, Anno 816. where *Wolfred* Archbishop of *Canterbury* presided:

“ Let, saith he, the Presbyters beware that when they administer the Sacrament of Baptism, they do not pour Water upon the Heads of the Infants, but let them be always plunged in the Font according to the Example of the Son of God himself, who was plunged in the Waters of *Jordan*. Thus must the Ceremony be performed according to order: See *Dr. Du-Veil* on the *Acts*, Chap. 2. p. 5, 6, 7.

The said learned Doctor saith in the same place, The constant Practice of the universal Church till the time of *Clement V.* who was crowned Pope Anno 1305, under whom, first of all, the second Synod of *Ravenna* approved the Abuse brought into some Churches about an hundred Years before, that Baptism without any necessity should be administered by Asperision. Hence it came to pass, that contrary to the Analogy, or intended Mystical Signification of this Sacrament, all the West, for the most part, has in this Age the use of *Rantism*, that is *Sprinkling* instead of *Baptism*, as *Zepher* speaks, to the great Scandal of the *Greeks* and *Russians*, who to this day plunge into the Water those they baptize, and deny any one to be rightly baptized, who is not plunged into the Water, according to the Precept of Christ, as we find in *Sylvesster Squropulus*.

Dr. Taylor saith, “ The Custom of the Ancient Church was not Sprinkling, but Immersion, in pursuance of the
“ Sense

“ Sense of the word Baptizing, and the Commandment and
 “ Example of our blessed Saviour.

Salmasius in his Notes of divers upon *Sulpitius Severus*, saith, that the word βαπτίζω signifies Immersion, not Sprinkling. Nor did the Antients otherwise baptize than by single or treble Immersion, as in the Greek Church to this day; saith he, the Person to be baptized is plunged over Head and Ears. The same thing does *Peter Avetabolis* testify of the *Asian* Christians inhabiting *Iberia* and *Colchi*.

St. Ambrose saith, “ Water is that wherein the Body is
 “ plunged, to wash all Sin away, there all Vice is buried.

In a Book inscribed, *Reformation of Ecclesiastical Laws*, printed at *London*, 1641. 'tis expressed in these words:

“ While we are plunged in the Water, the Death and Burial
 “ of Christ is recommended to us, that we openly testify
 “ that Sin lies dead and buried in us.

The *Roman Order*, published by the Writers concerning *Ecclesiastical Ceremonies*, says, the *Presbyters* enter into the Fountain within unto the Water, and the Males are first baptized, and then the Females.

Luther saith, “ The Name of Baptism is a Greek Word,
 “ it may be termed Dipping when we dip something in Wa-
 “ ter, that it may be wholly covered with Water; and al-
 “ tho (saith he) that Custom is now altogether abolished
 “ among the most part, for neither do they dip the whole
 “ Children, but only sprinkle them with a little Water,
 “ they ought nevertheless to be dipp'd, and presently drawn
 “ out again.

The *Germans* also call Baptism *Tauß* from *Deepness*, which they call *Tieff* in their Tongue; as if it were meet (saith our Author) that those be dipp'd deeply who are baptized.

John Bugenhagenius Pomeranus (both a Fellow and Successor in the Ministry of *Luther* at *Wittenburgh*, whom *Thuanus* and *Zanchinus* witness to have been a very moderate, godly and learned Man) affirms, that he was desired to be a VVitness at *Hamburg* in the Year 1529. that when he had seen the Minister only sprinkle the Infant wrapt in Swadling-Clothes on the top of the Head, he was amazed, because he neither had heard, or seen, or saw any such thing, nor yet read in any History, except in case of necessity in Bed-ridden Persons.

Hence in a General Assembly therefore of all the Ministers that were convened, he did ask of a certain Minister (*John Frize*

Frize by Name, who was sometimes Minister of *Lubec*) how the Sacrament of Baptism was administred at *Lubec*? who for his Piety and Candor, did answer, that Infants were baptized naked at *Lubec*, after the same fashion altogether as in *Germany*; but from whence and how that peculiar manner of baptizing had crept into *Hamburg* he was ignorant. At length they did agree among themselves that the Judgment of *Luther* and of the Divines at *Wittenburg* should be demanded about this Point; which thing being done, *Luther* wrote back to *Hamburg*, that the Sprinkling was an Abuse they ought to remove. Thus plunging was restored at *Hamburg*, yet is that Climate cooler than ours.

Mr. *Jos. Mede* saith there was no such thing as Sprinkling or Rantism [mark!] used in Baptism in the Apostles days, nor many Ages after. He had spoken more properly if he had said, there was no Rantism used in the Apostles days, but Baptism, than to say no Rantism used in Baptism, since he well knew they are two distinct and different Acts: It cannot be Baptism at all, if it be only Rantism or Sprinkling, Immersion or Dipping being the very thing, not an Accident, as I hinted, but an Essential so absolutely necessary, that it cannot be the Act or Ordinance without it.

If I command my Maid to dip my Handkerchief into the Water, and she only takes a little Water in her Hand and sprinkles a few drops upon it, doth she do what I command her? was that the thing, or is it not another Act? Even so 'tis here, you do not the thing, you rantise and baptize none unless you dip them into the Water.

Chamier also saith, the ancient use of Baptism was to dip the whole Body into the Element, therefore did *John* baptize in a River.

Dr. *Hammond* in his Annotations upon *John* 13. 10. saith, that βαπτισμὸς signifies an Immersion, or washing the whole Body, and which answereth to the Hebrew Word יטביל used for dipping in the Old Testament, and therefore tells us upon *Mat.* 3. that *John* baptized in a River, viz. in *Jordan*, *Mark* 1. 5. in a Confluence of Water, *John* 3. 23. because 'tis said there was much Water, which the Greeks called the Lakes where they used to wash: Also, saith he, the Antients called their Baptisterions, or the Vessels containing their Baptismal Water, *Columbethras*, viz. swimming or diving places, being very large, with Partitions for Men and Women.

The

The Learned Mr. Pool (or those Learned and Reverend Divines concerned in perfecting his most excellent *Annotations* on the holy Bible) says, a great part of those who went out to hear *John*, were baptized, that is, dipped in *Jordan*, on *John* 3. 6. and on *Mat.* 28. 20. say they, the first Baptism of which we read in Holy Writ, was dipping the Person baptized.

The Dutch Translation according to their Language reads it dipping.

Mat. 3. 16. *Ende Jesus Gedoopt zijn de is terstont Opgekomen uit hit water.* And when *Jesus* was dipp'd, he came out of the Water. And *Ver.* 6. *Ende wierden van hemge doopt in de Jordan.* And were dipped of him in *Jordan*. Hence they called *John* the Baptist *John* the Dipper. In Verse 1. *Ende in die dagen quam Jonnes de dooper predikenn in de woestijne van Judea.* In English thus : In those days came *John* the Dipper preaching in the Wilderness of *Judea*. Had our Translators translated the Greek word into our English Tongue as the Dutch have done it into theirs, it would have been read in our Bible *John* the Dipper ; and, for baptizing them in the Name of the Father, &c. it would have been read dipping them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and then the People would not have been deceived ; but they have not translated the Greek word at all, but left it in its Original Language : What difference is there between Baptism and the Greek word *Baptisma* ?

Mr. Ball in his Catechism doth not only say Faith was required of such who did desire Baptism, but also that the Party baptized was washed by dipping, &c. But to close with this, I argue thus, viz.

Since our Saviour sent his Disciples (to teach and baptize, or dip in the Name, &c.) into all Nations, viz. into cold Countries as well as hot ; and seeing Infants tender Bodies cannot bear dipping, without palpable danger of their Lives, it follows clearly that they are none of the Subjects Christ commanded to be dipp'd in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

To conclude with this, take one Argument, viz. If the proper, literal and genuine Signification of the Greek word *baptizo* is dipping, or to dip, then sprinkling is not baptizing : But the proper, literal and genuine Signification of the Greek word *baptizo* is dipping, or to dip : Ergo, Sprinkling is not Baptizing.

C H A P. IV.

Proving Baptism is Dipping, by the Practice of John Baptist, Christ and his Apostles.

2dly. **F**ROM the Practice of the Primitive Times. I have already shewed, that *John Baptist* baptized in the River *Jordan*, who was the first that received Commission to baptize. And *Diodate* on *Mat. 3.* says he plunged them in Water.

Piscator also saith, the ancient manner of baptizing was, that the whole Body was dipp'd into the Water.

So saith the Assembly in their Annotations.

Nay, say I, it had been a vain and needless thing for them to go to Rivers to baptize, if it had been only to sprinkle a little Water on the Face; for a Quart of Water might have served to have rantized a great number.

And had Sprinkling or Rantizing been the Ordinance, there is no Reason left to conceive why they should go to Rivers; nor would the Spirit of God have given that as the Reason why *John* baptized in *Enon* near *Salim*, viz. because there was much Water, *John 3. 23.*

But some strive to contradict the Holy Ghost, by making People believe there was not much Water in that place.

“ Because the Original reads not *πολυ ὕδωρ* much Water, but *πολλα ὕδατα*, many Waters; that is (say they) “ many Streams or Rivolets.

Answer. What difference is there between much Water, and many Waters? If they were Streams and Rivolets, tho not deep, yet if they were but a little while stopped with a Dam, they would soon rise to be deep enough to swim in, as Experience shews: But 'tis enough, there he baptized, saith the Holy Spirit, for there was much Water, or many Waters; there [for, or because] intimating plainly, that the Ordinance could not be administred with a little Water, but that it required many Waters, or much Water, a great deal more than a Bason could hold, or you hold in your Hand.

2. But 'tis objected, *Sandy's Travels* tell us that they were so shallow, as not to reach above the Ankles.

Ans. 1. Must we believe God's Word, or a lying Traveller? the Scripture saith there was much Water, or many Waters, and he says there was but a little.

2. In some shallow Rivolets we daily see, that in some places the Water is deep, and might it not be so in that? and this Traveller might not so curiously search or examine the matter.

3. Or might there not be a great Confluence of Water then, (as Dr. *Hammond* words it) and yet but little or shallow Water now, or when *Sandys* was there? Time alters Rivers as well, as other things. But if any seek after this manner to contradict the sacred Text, to defend their Childish Practice of Rantism, they deserve greatly to be blamed.

Take this Argument.

If the Holy Ghost gives it as the Reason why *John* baptized in *Enon* near *Salim*, viz. because there was much Water; then a little Water will not serve to baptize in.

But the Holy Ghost gives this as the Reason why *John* baptized in *Enon* near *Salim*, viz. because there was much Water: Ergo, a little Water will not serve to baptize in.

2dly. But to proceed; *Mark* 1. 9. 'tis said *Jesus* was baptized of *John* in *Jordan*. Now saith a Learned Man on the place, It had been Nonsense for St. *Mark* to say, that *Jesus* was baptized in *Jordan*, if he had been sprinkled, because the Greek reads it *eis* τὸ Ἰορδάνην, into *Jordan*: Could *Jesus* be said to be sprinkled into the River *Jordan*? 'tis proper to say he was dipped into *Jordan*, and that is and was the Act, and nothing else besure.

3dly. They went down both into the Water, both *Philip* and the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. What need had there been for them so to have done, had Baptism been sprinkling? Sure *Philip* would not have put that Noble Person (who was a Man of great Authority under *Candace* Queen of the *Ethiopians*) to that great trouble to come out of his Chariot, (if to sprinkle a little Water on his Face might have done) and to go down into the Water and dip him: Sure *Philip* would on this occasion have dispensed with Immersion, and let Aspersions or Rantism have served, considering he was a great Person, and on a Journey; he might have fetch'd a little Water in his Hand or otherwise, and have sprinkled him

him in his Chariot, as some Ministers do now in their public Places of Worship; and thus Men make void the Command of Christ by their Traditions to the abuse of Christian Baptism, and Reproach of us that keep to his sacred Institution.

Mr. *Daniel Rogers*, a most worthy Writer, says in a Treatise of his, "It ought to be the Church's part to cleave to the Institution, which is dipping, especially it being not left Arbitrary by our Church to the Discretion of the Minister, but required to dip or dive. And further saith, "That he betrays the Church, whose Minister he is, to a disordered Error, if he cleave not to the Institution.

O, what abundance of Betrayers of the Truth and of Churches too, have we in these as well as in former days! How little is the Institution of Christ, or Practice of the Primitive Churches minded by many good Men? Where is the Spirit of Reformation? And doubtless that famous Author, and Learned Critick in the Greek Tongue, *Casambon*, was in the right: Take his words.

"I doubt not (saith he) but, contrary to our Church's Intention, this Error having once crept in, is maintained still, by the carnal Ease of such, as looking more at themselves than at God, stretch the Liberty of the Church in this case, deeper and further than either the Church her self would, or the Solemnness of this Sacrament may well and safely admit. Afterwards he saith, "I confess my self unconvinced by Demonstrations of Scripture for Infants sprinkling.

The truth is, the Church gave too great Liberty; she had no Power to alter in the least matter, but to have kept exactly to the Institution. She says dipping [or sprinkling] that spoils all, that Addition gives Encouragement: VWho will dip the Person, that can believe the Church that sprinkling may serve? And O! how hard is it to retract an Error which hath been so long, and so generally received, especially when Carnal Ease and Profit attends the keeping of it up! and also when the true way of baptizing is reproached, and look'd upon to be so contemptible a Practice, and those who own it, and dare not act otherwise, villified and reproached (by many) with the scurrilous Name of *Anabaptists*, &c. altho we are as much against rebaptizing as any People in the VWorld can be.

The Learned *Cajetan* upon *Mat. 3.5.* saith, Christ ascended out of the Water, therefore Christ was baptized by *John*, not by sprinkling or pouring Water upon him, but by Immersion, that is, by dipping or Plunging into the Water.

Moreover, *Musculus* on *Mat. 3.* calls Baptism dipping, and says the Parties baptized were dipped, not sprinkled.

To close with this, take one Argument.

If the Baptizer and the Baptized in the days of Christ and his Apostles, went both down into the Water, and the Person baptized was dipped, then is Baptism not Sprinkling but Dipping.

But the Baptizer and the Baptized in the days of Christ and his Apostles, went both down into the Water, and the Person baptized was dipped.

Ergo, Baptism is not Sprinkling but Dipping.

C H A P. V.

Proving that Baptism is plunging or burying in Water the whole Body, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Wherein Mr. Owen's Arguments for sprinkling, and his Objections against Immersion or Dipping, are fully answered.

REader, thou mayst see that tho the remote Sense of the common word βαπτίζω baptizo, may refer to pouring of Water, yet the proper and genuine Sense of that word is dipping, or such a washing as is by dipping, which is abundantly proved, as you have heard, both by the Scriptures and Consent of a great Cloud of Witnesses amongst the Learned, both Antient and Modern: Therefore what *Mr. Owen* saith in the beginning of his *third Chapter*, viz. "That it is uncertain, whether in the New Testament, the Apostles baptized by dipping or sprinkling, is not true, it being evident it was by dipping and no other way. For where-ever the word Baptism is used (I say again) in the New Testament, as it refers to Christ's Ordinance of Baptism,

tism, it signifies dipping or plunging into the Water; nor can he prove the Jews washed their Hands and Cups only by pouring Water on them: tho' *Elijah* might have Water poured on his Hand, we commonly wash our Hands and Cups by dipping them into the Water. And so did the Jews. as Mr. *Ainsworth* affirms.

2dly. Sir, what you say concerning that Typical Baptism in the Cloud and Sea, you have heard also fully answered, and that makes not for sprinkling nor pouring. But more to that hereafter.

3dly. What you say concerning the Signification of Baptism, that it holds forth two things, 1. The Blood of Christ; 2. The Spirit of Christ, is far fetch'd: for the Lord's Supper holds forth the Blood of Christ; and we have no Ordinance ordain'd by Christ to hold forth in a Figure the sprinkling or pouring forth of the Spirit; if Man has invented such a thing, so be it. The *Papists* found out seven Sacraments with their significant Signs, as they tell you, and they have the same Parity of Reason to maintain their Sacraments without any Warrant from God's Word, as our Pedobaptists have for their baptizing, or rather rantizing or sprinkling of Babes. True, the Apostle speaks of sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus, but Baptism is no Figure of that, as you have heard, but primarily of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Sir, you say, "Sprinkling is lawful, because it is very probable that the Apostles themselves did baptize by pouring or sprinkling Water. *Acts* 2. 41. *Then they that gladly received the word, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them three thousand Souls.*" It is not, you say, very probable that these three thousand were plunged over Head and Ears in Water; How could *Peter*, and the rest of the Apostles, even twelve Men, baptize three thousand in one day, yea in one half day? how could they change their Apparel? &c.

Ans. 1. I answer, wonder no more how three thousand Persons should be baptized, i. e. dipped, in that short time; 'tis sufficient for any Christian to believe it, because the Holy Ghost hath said it.

2. But whereas you say there were but twelve Men to administer it, that is not true, there were the seventy Disciples no doubt with them, who were Ministers, and there might very probably be many more.

3. However, since Baptism is Immersion, i. e. dipping, and the Text says they were baptized, it follows they were dipped into the Water. What you say about *Ananias* baptizing *Paul*, and of *Paul's* baptizing the *Jaylor*, proves nothing, 'tis meer stuff that deserves no Answer.

You say *Paul* was baptized in his Lodging when he was sick.

Answer. It is not said he was sick, nor that he was baptized in his Lodging, read the Text again; true, 'tis said after he was baptized he received Strength. I have known multitudes of weak Persons baptized by dipping in frosty Weather, in our cold Climate, and never took any harm thereby.

We say Baptism is Dipping, and among many other Reasons, we argue it must needs be so administred, because *John* the Baptist baptized in *Jordan*, and in *Enon* near *Salim*, because there was much Water there; *Mat.* 3. 13. *John* 3. 23.

You answer, "If some were baptized by dipping, others were baptized by pouring Water on them, as we proved (say you) before, therefore both ways are lawful."

Answer; 1. 'Tis well our way of dipping is owned by you as lawful and a right way; then do you and all others take heed how you speak against us, who so administer the holy Ordinance of Baptism; it appears we err not in so doing by your own Confession.

2. But whereas you say you have proved, that some were in the Primitive Time baptized by pouring Water on them, we have shewed your Proofs to be too short and invalid.

3. The way of the Administration of Christ's sacred Ordinance was but one and the same in all the Churches of the Saints; and if some were baptized by dipping, and others by sprinkling, or pouring Water upon them, then the Ordinance must have different Significations, which could not be answered on some Persons, unless that they were both dipped and sprinkled, and had Water poured upon them, which is preposterous to imagine: for such that were dipped or buried under the Water, were thereby made in Sign and Signification conformable to the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, which we have so fully proved to be one great End of Baptism, that it cannot be denied; and such who were only sprinkled, they were taught

taught thereby the sprinkling of Christ's Blood, and of the Spirit, as you would have the Ordinance to signify, without any ground from God's VVord.

Now how unlikely it is that both these ways were used, this being considered, I shall leave to all wise and considerate Persons to think upon.

You say in the next place, " That the Scripture doth not say in any place, when they were baptized they were dipped: If (say you) those that are against sprinkling, say that they gather so much by Consequence from the fore-cited Scriptures, they ought to remember their rejecting Scriptural Consequences when they are used by us for proving Infant-Baptism, &c.

Ans^w. If I had not a Learned Man to deal with, I should not marvel. Sir, Is not Baptisin a Greek VVord? VVhat difference between Baptism and *Baptisma*? Is not βαπτίζω à βάπτω Greek? and is it not in *English* to dip? VVhat need of Consequences here? Had our Translators truly translated that word, they must have render'd it as the Dutch have, as I mentioned before, viz. *Ende Jhesus gedoopt zijnde, is ter-stont opgekloten uit hit wter*: and when Jhesus was dipp'd, he came out of the Water; Mat. 3. 16. and ver. 6. *Ende wierden van hemge doopt in de Jordan*; And were dipped of him in Jordan: Hence the Dutch call John the Baptist, John the Dooper, John the Dipper. As to your Consequences, we always deny that they are genuine, or naturally drawn from those Scriptures to which you refer. But whereas you say we have nothing for dipping which is of the Essence of Baptism, as we do affirm it is, but Consequences, it is too bold an Assertion, not being true, as by this time my honest Country-men may see, if they are impartial Persons.

" They think (say you) that John baptized by dipping, because he baptized in *Jordan*; they can never prove that was the Cause, for the Scripture doth not say what was the occasion why he baptized in *Jordan*.

Ans^w. Sir, look into your Greek Testament once again, and read Mark 1. 9. *eis τὸ Ἰορδάνην*, into *Jordan*; VVould it be proper to say he sprinkled them, or poured VVater on them into *Jordan*? It is proper to say he dipped them into *Jordan*, and that is Baptism, and nothing else, as it refers to Christ's Ordinance, viz. a washing by dipping or plunging into *Jordan*, or into the VVater.

2. Tho the Scripture doth not say in so many words, that that was the occasion of *John's* baptizing into *Jordan*: Yet, Sir, remember and tremble at that Text, *John* 3. 23. for there it is by the Holy Ghost given as the Reason why *John* baptized in *Enon* near *Salim*, viz. *because there was much Water there*; plainly denoting that a little Water will not serve to administer holy Baptism, but so much as will cover or bury the whole Body.

You add, "It being very doubtful whether those People that came unto him were dipped or plunged; for *there went out unto him Jerusalem and all Judea, and all the Regions round about Jordan, and were baptized by him*: We cannot judg (you say) that he baptized less than an hundred thousand Men and Women, &c. there were (you say) much more People in those Countries; but it being impossible for him to dip or plunge so many Men in so short time of his Ministry, which continued but three Years, and of these three Years he lay in Prison half a Year, so that he did neither preach or baptize but for two Years and a half. Vid. *Lights*. vol. I. p. 234.

"If he had baptized fifty every day on these two Years and a half, which is not probable he could do, the whole you say is but forty five thousand six hundred and twenty five, but he baptized much more, which could not be done by dipping or plunging; therefore it is reasonable for us (you say) to judg that he sprinkled or poured Water on them, &c.

Ans. As to what you say here, it seems very strange to me, that you should once imagine that *John* baptized all the People universally in *Jerusalem* and *Judea*, without Exception: Why did not you put in all the Infants too as well as Men and Women? I had lately to do with one Mr. *Exel*, who asserted that in a *Treatise* of his, which, with Shame enough to him, I gave an Answer unto. I am sorry you have no better Skill in Scripture-Rhetorick, where frequently, *per Synecdochen vel totius, vel partis*, a part is put for the whole, or the whole for the part, as 'tis said, *God would have all Men to be saved*, i. e. some of all sorts and degrees, as Kings, Noble-Men, Old, Young, Rich, Poor, &c. So 'tis said Christ, *when he was lifted up he would draw all Men unto him*, πάντας ἐλκύσω πρὸς ἑαυτὸν, *Joh.* 12. 32. Doth he mean every individual Person, or some of all sorts, of Jews and Gentiles? So *Paul* saith, *All seek their own*, &c.

Vid.

Vid. *Glassii Illerici Philolog. Sacr.* and also our late Annotators, the word or term [*All*] (they tell you) is here twice repeated, *Mat.* 3. 5. *καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰερουσαλὴμ, καὶ ἡ Ἰουδαία, &c.* it is enough to let us know that in Scripture 'tis significative no farther than many; for, say they, it cannot be imagined that every individual Person in *Jerusalem*, and all the Regions round about *Jordan* went to hear *John* the Baptist.

2. You forget that Text, *John* 3. 26. Behold him that thou bearest witness of, &c. the same baptizeth, and All Men come unto him, *καὶ πάντες ἔρχονται πρὸς αὐτόν*, i. e. to *Jesus Christ*. Also 'tis said, *John* 4. 1, 2. That *Jesus* made and baptized more Disciples than *John*. If *John* baptized them all, and *Jesus* baptized them all, then they were all twice baptized, or all re-baptized, and if so, were indeed properly all *Ana-baptists*.

Sir, in both places it intends but some. You worthy and beloved *Britains*, take heed how you are led by a Man that argues so preposterously; I doubt not but he may be a good Man, but under a Cloud of Darkness.

3. Sir, how Dr. *Lightfoot* or you can prove, that *John* preached but two Years and a half, I see not; but had he every day baptized an hundred, he might with much Ease have done it in the space of four hours time, or thereabouts: But alas! neither he nor our Saviour had so many Disciples as you imagine; the Number of the Disciples after the Resurrection of Christ, as we read, *Acts* 1. were but an hundred and twenty that were together, perhaps there might be some few more in some other parts.

4. But you, I perceive, contradict the Holy Ghost in saying, that *John* sprinkled them, i. e. rantized them; for Rantizing in the Original (as I presume you know) is sprinkling in English. Sir, I appeal to your Conscience, whether it be not so: Sprinkling and pouring is one thing, and baptizing another, and a quite different Act. I affirm Sprinkling is not Baptizing, say what you will.

You in the next place, mention that which we object concerning *Philip* and the *Eunuch*, who went both down into the Water when the *Eunuch* was baptized. To this you answer and say, "How doth that follow? Could they not go into the Water without plunging in it? We read in *Gen.* 24. 45. (say you) that *Rebecca* went down into the Well, Does it follow that she was plunged in it? You
" will

“ will say of your Maid-Servant, when she goes to draw
 “ Water, she went down into the River, your meaning is
 “ not that she was plunged there.

I answer, *Rebecca* might properly be said to go down into the Well, because in some Wells there are several Steps or Stairs before we come to the Water; 'tis not said she went into the Water. Also who of us could say when our Servant-Maid went to draw Water, or fetch Water from a River, she went into the River? if any do say so, they speak not truly, but indeed do lie. Sir, take heed what you say, the Holy Ghost doth not say they went down to the Water, but *εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ*, both went down into the Water, and he baptized him, *i. e.* dipp'd him, not rantiz'd him.

“ You bring in our Objection against your Sprinkling
 “ taken from *Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 12, 13. viz.* we are said
 “ to be buried with Christ in Baptism into Death. To this
 “ you say, “ We bury by casting Earth on the Body, and
 “ the pouring of Water, you say, doth represent it; it
 “ cannot be said one was buried that was fallen under
 “ Water or Earth, unless he remains there for a time: he
 “ that descendeth into a Coal-pit is under the Earth, but
 “ is not buried by reason he cometh out from thence immediately; dipping therefore doth not signify a Burial,
 “ unless he that is dipped remains for a time under the
 “ Water.

I answer; 'Tis true, we do bury by casting Earth on the dead Body, but 'tis so much Earth as covers the Corps all over, or else 'tis not buried. So if you pour Water on a Child until it is covered all over in Water, it may truly be said that Child was buried in the Water, altho the burying in Baptism is not by pouring Water in great abundance until it is covered, but by going into the Water and there to be dipped, or plunged all over, so that all may see the Body is buried under Water, as truly, symbolically, and as properly as if it had been buried in the Water. Or,

2. Tho a Person be laid in the Grave, and covered all over with Earth, tho it be but two Minutes, he may as truly and properly be said to be buried, as he that lies there three Days, or a thousand Years. But you would have Baptism to be no proper Representation of a Burial, unless the Person baptized lies so long till he be drowned. Sir, Baptism doth represent the Death of Christ, and
 of

of the old Man, or Body of Sin, which is as sufficiently held forth by a Minute or two, as by many Days.

3. And now, utterly to put to silence your vain Objections, I shall give the Sense of a whole Cloud of Witnesses, as to the proper Exposition of those Texts, *Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 12, 13.* by and by; but if my honest Country-men do think you have given a better Sense of the Words than all those Learned Men, I will say no more.

" You say, the Resemblance then between Baptism doth
" not stand in the dipping of the Body so much as in the
" End of the Ordinance, in making us Partakers of Christ's
" Death, of his Life, and of his Ascension, and of his
" sitting on the Right hand of God.

" Baptism makes us to be planted together in the Like-
" ness of his Death; yet there are none, you say, that plants
" Bodies in Water by baptizing them, *Rom. 6. 5.*

Ans. We shall in our next Chapter finally determine this great Point, and plainly shew you by manifest Arguments, together with the joint Consent and Agreement of a multitude of Learned Men, that were and are Pedo-baptists, that the Resemblance between Death, Burial and Resurrection, and Baptism, doth stand in the outward Sign of Dipping, as well as in our partaking of the Blessing of Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection. All know in the Ordinance of the Lord's-Supper the Signs are significant, and no true Protestant will admit of such an Administration of it, in which the breaking of Christ's Body, and the shedding of his Blood is not clearly represented to the sight of our Eyes. Why is the Popish way of the Administration rejected, who deny the Laity the Cup, if there ought not to be an exact keeping to the direct Signs, as well as to bear in Mind the Thing signified thereby? Nay, Sir, I find you in your third Chapter to justify your sprinkling stily, by arguing for an Agreement between the Sign and the Thing signified, and that Baptism was not ordained to be a Sign or Symbol of the sprinkling Christ's Blood, but of his Death, Burial and Resurrection: It shall (God assisting) be further demonstrated.

Now let this be considered, That as in the Lord's-Supper it is such a quantity of Bread and Wine that is to be used, that may represent his Body broken, and his Blood shed; and as that Sacrament was appointed to that very end and purpose, so in like manner we also say, so much Water
mu

must be used as may represent the Death, Burial and Resurrection of our blessed Saviour. But one Mr. *Burkitt*, a *Pedo-baptist*, saith in his *Treatise of Infant-Baptism*, *That in the Sacraments it is not the quantity of Elements, but the Signification of them that ought to be attended to; in Circumcision* (saith he) *it was not the quantity of Flesh cut off, so much as the Signification of it, &c.* and you seem to express your self to the same purpose.

Ans. To which I returned him this Answer, *viz.* There must be so much Bread and Wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper, that may represent Christ's Body broken, and so much Wine as may in Sign as well as Signification hold forth the pouring forth of Christ's precious Blood, or else the End of Christ is not answered in that Sacrament; and so likewise must the Burial and Resurrection of Christ be in Sign, as well as our Death to Sin and rising again to Newness of Life is represented in holy Baptism.

Should the People of *Israel* in Circumcision only have cut off a little bit of the Fore-skin of the Flesh, and not round quite off, or only have paired off the Nails of their Childrens Fingers with a little Skin with it, would that have answered the Mind of God in that *Rite*, or they have been born with in pleading it might as well answer Circumcision in Signification? But the Vanity and Sinsfulness of this Assertion of Mr. *Burkitt's* and yours will yet be now further laid open in this Chapter; only there is one thing before I proceed on that I shall add a word or two unto, as touching what you say concerning those Washings that were used under the Law, which are called Baptisms, which you say were done by sprinkling, which is not true; we utterly deny any of those Washings which are called Baptisms were either sprinkling or pouring of Water on them, but total dipping of their whole Body. And so the Reverend Mr. *Ainworth*, a Man very Learned in all Jewish Rites and Ceremonies, affirms, on *Levit. 11. 31.* see his *Annotat.* on that Text, these are his words, *viz.* *All that are unclean, whether Men or Vessels, are not cleansed but by dipping or baptizing in Water; and wheresoever the Law speaketh of washing a Man's Flesh, or washing of Clothes for Uncleaness, it is not but by dipping the whole Body therein. And whether they be Men or Vessels, there may not be any thing between them and the Water to keep them asunder, as Clay, Pitch, or the like that cleaveth to the Body or Vessel; if there be, then, saith he, they*
are

are unclean, and their washing profiteth them not. He cites for this *Maim Mikvaoh*, c. 1. §. 12.

Sir, what is become of your sprinkling of *Cups, Pots* and *Brazen Vessels* among the Jews, when 'tis said they washed or baptized them? it appears their way in washing was total dipping, or else they were not clean. And now to proceed to prove Christ's Baptism in Water is by Immersion, by Dipping, to represent in Sign his Death, Burial and Resurrection, and in Signification to hold forth our Death unto Sin and rising again to walk in Newness of Life who are baptized, I shall add it in this place,

First, *From the Scripture.*

Secondly, *By the Consent, Agreement and Arguments of a Cloud of Witnesses, both Antient Fathers and Modern Divines, and worthy Protestant Writers.*

1. The first Scripture is, *Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5, 6. Therefore we are buried with him in Baptism, &c.* The Saints or whole Church of the Romans were to reckon themselves dead to Sin, and bound to live no longer therein, and that because by Baptism (as in a lively Figure) they held forth the same thing; so that it appears Baptism hath a twofold Signification.

(1.) There is in it, when truly and rightly administred, not only a Representation of Christ's Burial and Resurrection, but,

(2.) Also it signifies our Death unto Sin, and our rising again to walk in Newness of Life; and indeed the Apostle makes use of this as an Argument to press Newness of Life (the thing signified in Baptism) upon them all; as if he should say, As many of us as are baptized must know this, that we are baptized into Christ's Death, and therefore must die to Sin and live a new Life: But we have all been baptized, or buried with him in Baptism, therefore must all of us die to Sin and live a new Life.

Our late Annotators on the place say thus, He seems to allude to the manner of baptizing in those warm Countries, which was, say they, to dip or plunge the Party baptized, and as it were to bury him for a while under Water. *Cajetan* upon the same Text says, "We are buried with Christ by Baptism unto Death; by our burying he declares our Death by the Ceremony of Baptism, because he (that is, the Party baptized) is put under Water; and by this carries a Similitude of him that was buried,

buried, who was put under the Earth. Now because none are buried but dead Men, from this very thing that we are buried in Baptism, we are assimilated to Christ buried, or when he was buried.

The *Assembly in their Annotations* on this Text of Scripture, say likewise thus, *viz.* "In this Phrase the Apostle seems to allude to the ancient manner of baptizing, which was to dip the Party baptized, and as it were to bury them under Water for a while, and then raise them up again out of it, to represent the Burial of the old-Man, and the Resurrection to Newness of Life. The same saith *Diodate*.

Tilenus, a great *Protestant Writer*, speaks fully in this case: "Baptism, saith he, is the first Sacrament of the New Testament instituted by Christ, in which there is an exact Analogy between the Sign and the Thing signified. The outward Rite in Baptism is threefold.

1. *Immersion into the Water.*
2. *Abiding under the Water.*
3. *A Resurrection out of the Water.*

The Form of Baptism, *viz.* External and Essential, is no other than an Analogical Proportion, which the Signs keep with the Thing signified thereby: For the Property of the Water washing away the Defilements of the Body, does in a most futable Similitude, set forth the Efficacy of Christ's Blood in blotting out of Sin; so dipping into the Water, in a most lively Similitude sets forth the Mortification of the old Man, and rising out of the Water the Vivification of the new Man: The same plunging into the Water, saith he, holds forth to us that horrible Gulph of Divine Justice, in which Christ, for our sakes, for a while was in a manner swallowed up; abiding under the Water, (how little time soever) denotes his Descent into Hell, even the very deepest of Lifelessness, lying in the sealed or guarded Sepulchre, where he was accounted as one dead. Rising out of the Water, holds forth to us a lively Similitude of that Conquest which this dead Man got over Death. In like manner, saith he, 'tis therefore meet that we being baptized into his Death, and buried with him, should rise also with him, to go on in a new Life. Thus far

And let all thinking and serious Christians carefully consider, since this sacred Ordinance was appointed to be thus significant, as this and other Learned Men observe, what a sad and lamentable thing it is, that the true Baptism should be changed from dipping into sprinkling, which neither doth nor can hold forth these great Mysteries, for which purpose our Saviour ordained it: For 'tis evident *Rantism* or Sprinkling doth not bear any Proportion to these Mysteries, nor can they be signified thereby. What Figure of a Burial of Christ, or of the old Man is there in sprinkling a few drops of VVater on a Person's Face? Or what Representation is there in that Act of a Resurrection? O, how is Christ's holy Baptism abused by this devised *Rantism*, and the Signification thereof destroyed! the Lord open your Eyes, or the Eyes of my godly and impartial Reader. This shews you clearly what Christ's true Baptism is, as also the true Subject. But to proceed.

St. *Ambrose* saith, VVater is that wherein the Body is plunged, to wash away all Sins; there all Sins, saith he, are buried. We suppose he means 'tis a Sign of this, *i. e.* that all Sin is buried.

Moreover *Chrysostom* saith, that the Old Man is buried and drown'd in the Immersion under Water; and when the baptized Person is afterwards raised up out of the Water, it represents the Resurrection of the New Man to Newness of Life; and therefore concludes the contrary Custom, being not only against Ecclesiastical Law, but against the Analogy and Mystical Signification of the Sacrament, is not to be complied with.

It has been too long, as I have formerly noted, God grant Men more Light to see their Error, and abhor to do so any more.

Kecker says, "That Immersion, not Asperision, was the first Institution of Baptism, as it doth, saith he, plainly appear from *Rom. 6.3.* And say I, VVhere hath Christ since the first Institution, instituted Asperision, or Sprinkling in the stead or room of Immersion or Dipping; or given Orders to change that significant Sign into the insignificant Fopperry of Sprinkling? Ought not we to keep the Ordinances as they were first instituted and given to the Saints? Is not God's Word to be our Rule in all Points of Faith and Practice to the End of the World? Has Christ given any Men or Church a Dispensation to change his Laws and

and Ordinances, or make them void by these Traditions, or set up their Post by his Post ?

How doth God complain by the Prophets against his People of old, for presuming to change his Laws, *Deut.* 12. 13 ? God gave particular Command to make an Altar of Gold to offer Incense, *Exod.* 40. 5. and he commanded, *Exod.* 20. 24, 25. that his Altar should be made of Earth or rough Stone: but in *Isa.* 65. 3. he reproves their horrid Transgressions and Disobedience, in acting contrary to his expreis Institution. *A People (saith God) that provoketh me to Anger continually to my Face, that sacrificeth in Gardens, and burneth Incense upon Altars of Brick.* You may think that was no great Error, instead of Gold or Stone, to make Altars of Brick: but what saith God? they for this, &c. provoke me continually to my Face. O tremble ye who adventure to transgress God's Precept in as bad or worse a manner ! Who commanded you to baptize or dip Believers in the Name of the Father, &c. and you rantize or sprinkle Infants ? Alas, you know not how you hereby provoke God ! altho he is yet silent, and doth not manifest his Displeasure, yet know he is a jealous God, and hath the like Zeal for his Gospel-Institutions, as ever he had of those under the Law, and may manifest it too in his own time. But to proceed, and call in for more Witnesses against your Practice.

Daille on the Fathers saith, that it was a Custom heretofore in the antient Church to plunge those they baptized over Head and Ears in the Water: And, saith he, *Tertullian* in his third Book *de Cor. Mil.* *Cyprian* in his seventieth Epistle, p. 211, &c. and others testify it.

Dr. Cave saith, that the Party baptized was wholly immersed, or put under the Water, which was the almost constant and universal Custom of those Times, whereby they did most notably and significantly expreis the great Ends and Effects of Baptism: For as in immersing there are in a manner three several Acts; the putting the Person into the Water, his abiding under the Water, and his rising up again, thereby representing Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, and in our Conformity thereunto, our dying to Sin, the Destruction of its Power, and our Resurrection to a new course of Life; So by the Person's being put into the Water, was lively represented the putting off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, &c. by his being under it (which is a kind of Burial into the Water) his entering into a State of

of Death or Mortification, like as Christ remained for some time under the State or Power of Death: therefore 'tis said, *As many as are baptized into Christ, are baptized into his Death, &c.* And then by Immersion, or rising up out of the Water, is signified his entering upon a new course of Life; that like as Christ was raised up by the Glory of the Father, so we should walk in Newness of Life. Thus *Dr. Cave.*

We are said, saith *Pareus*, to die, and to be buried with Christ in Baptism. And further shews, that the external Act of being buried in Water is a lively Emblem of the internal Work of Regeneration.

St. Bernard saith, Immersion is a Representation of Christ's Death and Burial.

Against all these Testimonies and multitudes more of the best and most Learned Writers, *Mr. Burkitt* objects as follows, and you seem to argue after the same manner; these are his words, *viz.*

If Baptism administred by pouring water on the Face (representing the whole Person) doth answer the Use and End of Baptism, as well as when administred by dipping or plunging, then dipping is not essentially and absolutely necessary in the Act of baptizing: but the one answereth the Use and End of baptizing as well as the other, therefore the one cannot be more essential than the other.

What is the End and Use of Baptism, but to represent to our Minds the Effusion of Christ's Blood for to take away the Guilt of Sin, and the pouring forth of the Spirit for the purging away the Filth of it? Now (says he, and you to the same purpose) the sprinkling of the Blood of Christ, and the pouring forth of the holy Spirit upon the Infant, are more fully and plainly represented by Baptism as administred by sprinkling than by dipping. He says further, That if the inward and spiritual Grace signified by Baptism be more lively represented by sprinkling than by dipping, then surely sprinkling is not only lawful, but more expedient than dipping: but the inward and spiritual Grace signified by Baptism, to wit, the cleansing the Soul by the Grace and Spirit of Christ, is more lively represented by sprinkling than by dipping; therefore more expedient, and accordingly we find Almighty God himself often expressing the Mercy of Sanctification by this Action; *Ezek. 36. 25* *Then will I sprinkle clean Water upon you, and ye shall be clean, &c.*

Ans. 1. To this I answer, where the Thing signified is not, the Sign is a nullity; but your Thing signified in sprinkling VWater on the Face of an Infant, *viz.* the holy Spirit and Graces of it, does not appear in those Infants you so sprinkle: *Ergo*, Your Sign is a nullity. If Grace was in them so much as in the Habit of it, when they are grown up the Act and Fruits of the Spirit and Faith would shew themselves; for Grace is an active and lively Principle where-ever it is infused.

2. And I positively deny that the End and Use of Baptism is or can be represented by sprinkling or pouring of VWater; but by what I have said and produced, by the Testimony of the Scripture, and almost all Learned Men, both Ancient Fathers, and Modern Divines, I have fully shewed the contrary.

3. I thought the Sacrament of the Lord's-Supper had been instituted by Christ, to signify the Effusion, or pouring forth his precious Blood, and not Baptism. VVill you confound the Use and End of one Sacrament with the other, to maintain your own Innovation and Abuse of Christ's holy Baptism?

4. Might not the Jews, who instead of making Altars of Gold or Stone, made them Altars of Brick, say, that Altars of Brick might serve as well to answer the Use and End of burning Incense? Nay, may be they might say, they had not the other to do it, and therefore built their Altars of Brick: But would this Pretence do? No, no, what saith the Almighty God? *They provoke me continually to my Face.* Also might not others argue thus about the Sacrament of the Supper, *viz.* VVhat need we have VVine? If we use Mum or some other Red Liquor, instead of the Fruit of the Grape, it will answer the Use and End of that Sacrament as well as VVine. O, whither would this lead us!

5. VVe utterly deny that Baptism was ordain'd or instituted by Christ to signify either the pouring forth of his Blood, or the pouring forth of the holy Spirit, and must tell you, that you affirm what you please, without any Proof from God's VVord. But by the way, let the Reader observe how you go from sprinkling to pouring VWater on the Face of Infants. I question whether you ever do so or not; but if you should, that would be no more Christ's Baptism than sprinkling.

You are not to devise new Signs or Symbols of Spiritual Mysteries, of which God speaks nothing in his VVord, nor ever instituted to such Ends. I affirm he has appointed no Rite or Ordinance in the Gospel to represent the sprinkling or pouring forth of the holy Spirit. The Papists have (you know) seven Sacraments, and they tell us of the Use and End of them, and how wonderfully significant they are, and yet all the Use and Signification of them were the Contrivances of their own wicked Hearts: And I must tell you that they prove what they do and say for their Sacraments as well as you do. As to what you speak of pouring or sprinkling, take what *Tho. Aquinas* most excellently hath said on this account. " It belongs to the Signifier (says he) " to determine what Sign is to be used for the Signification: " But God it is, who by things sensible, signifies spiritual " things in the Sacrament.

Christ hath ordained Baptism to be a Sign, Symbol, or lively Representation of his own Death, Burial and Resurrection, as I have proved and confirmed by a Cloud of Witnesses. Will God endure or suffer Men (think you) to invent out of their own Brains, new Signs and Symbols of Divine Gospel-Mysteries, and then father them upon him, and call them his Ordinances? Nay, more, be so bold as to say, these are more useful, and answer better the End of God, than those which he himself instituted? For thus you and other Pede-baptists speak of Sprinkling, viz. 'tis not only lawful, but more expedient than Dipping. And hereby you seem to teach God Wisdom, or to magnify yours above his. Be astonished, O Heavens! Be thou horribly amazed, O Earth! Were ever any Men thus bold before? First, You contrive a new Rite, and new Significations of it, which God never appointed to represent such things, and then say, 'tis more expedient than Christ's Ordinance of dipping, which was instituted by him for other Ends and Significations; whereas the whole Body of all learned Men and Christians, witness to and testify the contrary.

Pray take what Sir *Norton Knatchbul* hath wrote, in direct opposition to what you affirm. Saith he, " Baptism, " which now saves us by Water (speaking of the Text, " in *1 Pet. 3. 21.*) that is, by the assistance of Water, " and is antitypical of the *Ark of Noah*, does not signify " the laying down the Filth of the Flesh, but the Cove-

" nant of a good Conscience towards God, while we are
 " plunged in the Water, which is to testify our Belief of
 " the Resurrection of Jesus Christ; so that there is a mani-
 " fest *Antithesis* between these words, by *Water*, and by
 " the *Resurrection*. Nor is (saith he) the Elegancy of it
 " displeasing. *As if he should say*, the Ark of *Noah*, not the
 " Flood, was a Type of Baptism, and Baptism was an
 " Antitype of the Ark: Not as if Baptism is a washing
 " away of the Filth of the Flesh by Water, wherein it
 " answers not at all to the Ark; but as it is the Covenant
 " of a good Conscience towards God by the Resurrection
 " of Christ, in the belief of which Resurrection we are
 " saved, as they were saved by the Ark of *Noah*; for the
 " Ark and Baptism were both a Type and Figure of the
 " Resurrection: so that the proper End [mark] of Baptism
 " ought not to be understood as if it were a Sign of the
 " washing away of Sin, (although it be thus oftentimes
 " taken Metonymially in the New Testament, and by the
 " Fathers) but a particular Signal of the Resurrection, by
 " Faith in the Resurrection of Christ, of which Baptism
 " is a lively and emphatical Figure, as also was the Ark,
 " out of which *Noah* returned as from a Sepulchre, to a
 " new Life; and therefore not unaptly called by *Philo*, the
 " Captain of the new Creation; and the Whale's Belly,
 " out of which *Jonas*, after a Burial of three days, was
 " set at liberty; and the Cloud, and the Red Sea, in which
 " the People of *Israel* are said to have been baptized, *i. e.*
 " not washed [mark] but buried: for they were all Types
 " of the same thing as Baptism, *viz.* not the washing a-
 " way of Sin, but of the Death and Resurrection of
 " Christ, and our own; to which the Apostles, the Fa-
 " thers, the Scholasticks, [mark] and all Interpreters a-
 " gree. The thing (saith he) is so apparent, as not to
 " need any Testimonies; but because there are not a few
 " who do not vulgarly teach this Doctrine, it will not be
 " superfluous to produce some of those innumerable Testi-
 " monies, that I may (saith he) not seem to speak without
 " Book. And,

" First, Let us begin with St. *Paul*, *Rom. 6. 3.* Know
 " ye not, that so many of you that have been baptized
 " into Christ, were baptized into his Death? Therefore we
 " are buried with him in Baptism into his Death, &c.
 " Else what shall they do that are baptized for the Dead,
 " if

“ if the Dead rise not ? *As if he had said*, If there be no
 “ Resurrection, why are we baptized? In vain does the
 “ Church use the Symbol of Baptism, if there be no Re-
 “ surrection. The like Testimonies frequently occur among
 “ the Fathers (saith he).

“ *Ignatius* saith, That believing in his Death, we may
 “ be made Partakers of his Resurrection by Baptism.
 “ Baptism was given in Memory of the Death of our Lord,
 “ we perform the Symbols of his Death [mark] not of
 “ pouring forth his Blood, or holy Spirit, or sprinkling
 “ the Spirit on us, or the Blood of Christ: No, no, this,
 “ that Author says, is not signified in Baptism, but the
 “ Burial and Resurrection of Christ, which sprinkling no
 “ manner of ways can represent.

“ *Justin Martyr* saith, We know but one saving Baptism,
 “ in regard there is but one Resurrection from the dead,
 “ of which Baptism is an Image.

And from hence, say I, we know not Infants Rantism or
 Sprinkling, for this is none of Christ's true Baptism.
 Christ's Baptism is but one, and 'tis that of Believers, and
 'tis not sprinkling but dipping, to signify Christ's Burial
 and Resurrection. He goes on and cites other Authors.

“ Hear *Paul* exclaiming, They pass through the Sea, and
 “ were all baptized in the Cloud and in the Sea.

“ He calls Baptism the Passage of the Sea, for it was a
 “ flight of Death caused by Water.

“ To be baptized, and so plunged, and to return up
 “ and rise out of the Water, is a Symbol of the Descent
 “ into the Grave, and returning from thence.

“ Baptism is a Pledg and Representation of the Resur-
 “ rection: Baptism is an Earnest of the Resurrection:
 “ Immersion is a Representation of Death and Burial. In-
 “ numerable are the Testimonies (saith *Sir Norton*) which
 “ might be added, but these I think sufficient to prove,
 “ that Baptism is an Image of the Death and Resurrection
 “ of Christ (from whence we acknowledg the Mystery of
 “ our Religion, saith he, Christ's Deity and Humanity)
 “ and of the Faithful, who are baptized in his Faith, from
 “ Death in Sin to Newness of Life, which if they lead
 “ in this World, they have a most assured Hope, that
 “ being dead, they shall hereafter rise to Glory with Christ.
 Thus *Sir Norton Knatchbull*, a worthy Knight.

Mr. *Perkins* saith, The dipping of the Body signifies Mortification, or Fellowship with Christ in his Death ; the staying under the Water signifies the Burial of Sin, and coming out of the Water, the Resurrection from Sin to Newness of Life. In another Treatise of his, he saith, the ancient Custom of baptizing, was to dip, as it were to dive all the Body of the baptized in Water ; *Rom. 6.* Council of *Laodicea* and *Neocesarea*.

And here let me add what Reverend Dr. *Sharp* (the present Archbishop of *York*) hath lately delivered in a Sermon preached before the Queen's Majesty on Easter-day, *March* the 27th, 1692. " And this in ancient Times was
" taught every Christian (saith he) in and by his Baptism: Whenever a Person was baptized, he was not
" only to profess his Faith in Christ's Death and Resurrection, but he was also to look upon himself as obliged
" in Correspondence therewith, to mortify his former
" carnal Affections, and to enter upon a new State of
" Life.

" And the very form of Baptism (saith he) did lively
" represent his Obligation to them: For what did their
" being plung'd under Water signify, but their undertaking
" in Imitation of Christ's Death and Burial, to forsake all
" their former evil Courses? as their ascending out of the
" Water did their Engagement to lead a holy, spiritual
" Life. This our Apostle doth more than once declare to
" us: thus *Rom. 6. 3, 4.* We are buried (saith he) with
" Christ by Baptism unto Death, that like as Christ was
" raised up by the Glory of the Father, so we should
" walk in Newness of Life. Thus far Dr. *Sharp*, his Sermon on *Phil. 3. 10.* pag. 9.

Dr. *Fowler* (now Lord Bishop of *Glocester*) on *Rom. 6. 3, 4.* saith, " Christians being plunged into the Water, signifies their undertaking and obliging themselves in a
" spiritual Sense, to be buried with Jesus Christ in an
" utter renouncing and forsaking all their Sins, that so
" answering to his Resurrection, they may live a holy and
" a godly Life. *Design of Christianity*, p. 90.

Also Dr. *Sherlock* (Dean of *St. Paul's*) on *Rom. 6. 3, 4.* saith, " Our Conformity to the Death and Resurrection of
" our Saviour consists in dying to Sin, and walking in
" Newness of Life: Which, saith he, *St. Paul* tells us, is
" represented by the external Ceremony of Baptism, and
" rising

“ rising out of his watery Grave, a new born Creature.
Charity without Usury, p. 1.

And unto these, let me add what the Pious and Reverend Dr. Tillotson (late Archbishop of Canterbury) hath wrote; speaking of the same Text, *Rom. 6. 3, 4.* “ Antiently, “ saith he, those who were baptized put off their Gar- “ ments, which signified their putting off the Body of Sin, “ and were immersed and buried in the Water, to repre- “ sent the Death of Sin; and then did rise up again out of “ the Water to signify their Entrance upon a new Life. “ And to these Customs the Apostle alludes, when he says, “ *How shall we that are dead to Sin, live any longer therein?* “ *Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus* “ *Christ, were baptized into his Death?* &c.

I. 'Tis a hard case, you neither will believe the holy Scripture, the Antient Fathers and Modern Divines, nor other learned Prelates of the Church of *England*, who are yet living; but, contrary to the nature and tendency of holy Baptism, plead for Sprinkling and condemn Dipping, and cast Reproach upon it, and say also, that the Thing signified thereby, is the pouring forth of *Christ's Blood*, or the sprinkling and pouring out of the *holy Spirit*, notwithstanding we prove from the Scripture, and with the Testimony of all these great Men, that Baptism signifies the Death, Burial and Resurrection of *Jesus Christ*, and not any of those things you affirm as your own Conceit, without the Testimony of any learned or approved Author.

Therefore, Sir, that Baptism is any thing else than dipping, plunging or washing, which is done by dipping, we do utterly deny: For as the cutting off a little bit of the Foreskin of the Flesh, or not the twentieth part round, is not Circumcision; so sprinkling a little Water on the Face is not Baptism.

True, you call it Baptism, and will do so, tho' 'tis nothing less nor more than Rantism, 'tis not the Thing, nor does it answer in Signification. I may tell you again, that the Jews instead of circumcising the Foreskin of their Childrens Flesh, might have as well presumed to dispense with that, and only have paired off the Nails of the Fingers of their Male Infants, and have called that Circumcision, as you may call sprinkling or pouring a little Water, Baptism. But may be you'll say, in Circumcision they were to draw Blood, so say I, they might in cutting the Nails

of their Childrens Fingers ; nay, and they might better plead, that the Things signified in Circumcision, might be as well answered in that new Device (the Nails being a sort of Excrement they might say signified the taking away the Filth of Sin, or Corruption of Nature) as the great Mysteries signified by Baptism or Dipping, can be represented by sprinkling or pouring.

Furthermore, they might possibly plead the same Pre-
*re*nces you do, *viz.* *The cutting off the Foreskin of the Flesh* put the Infants to great Pain ; nay, may be they might fancy it would cost them their Lives ; nay, call it Murder, and therefore let pairing of their Nails serve : As you it seems fear dipping would endanger the Lives of Infants, and therefore make sprinkling to serve instead thereof. But to proceed.

2. I am in amaze to see these Men speak so fully and clearly to this glorious Truth, (*i. e.* that the great thing Christ ordained Baptism to represent, is his Death, Burial and Resurrection, together with the baptized Person's Death to Sin, and his rising again to walk in Newness of Life) and yet both those shameful Abuses amongst you and other Churches are not rectified, *viz.*

1. That Sprinkling, which doth not, cannot answer or represent those Gospel-Mysteries, should not be rejected.

2. That Infants should be once deem'd the proper Subjects of Baptism, since nothing of a Death to Sin, nor rising again to walk in Newness of Life, can appear in them. For, as the Learned observe, Baptism is a Symbol of present, not future Regeneration : 'Tis an outward Sign of that inward Death unto Sin, which the Party baptized passed under then, or ought to have done, when (or before) he is baptized. They then professed themselves to be dead to Sin, *i. e.* even when they were buried with Christ in their Baptism ; for the Argument of the Apostle lies in that respect : *How shall we that are dead unto Sin, live any longer therein ? Knowing that so many of us who have been baptized into Christ, were baptized into his Death, both in Sign and Signification : And therefore, as Dr. Sherlock says, rising out of that watery Grave a new born Creature, denotes not only what they should be hereafter, but what they were actually at that time. So that as this Text, and Arguments drawn therefrom, utterly condemn Sprinkling as not being Christ's Baptism, so it excludes Infants from being*
the

the Subjects thereof, because in them appears no such Death to Sin, nor can they be said to come out of that watery Grave as new born Creatures. To these Testimonies I shall only add one or two more.

See that most learned *Anonymous* French Writer, in his Answer to the famous Bishop of Meaux; "'Tis most certain (saith he) that Baptism hath not hitherto been administered otherwise than by sprinkling, by the most of *Protestants*; but truly this sprinkling is an Abuse. This Custom, which, without an accurate Examination they have retained from the *Romish Church*, in like manner as many other things, makes their Baptism very defective. It corrupteth its Institution and ancient Use, and that Nearness of Similitude which is needful should be betwixt it and Faith, Repentance and Regeneration. This Reflection of Mr. *Bossuet* deserveth to be seriously considered, to wit (saith he) that this use of plunging hath continued for the space of a whole thousand and three hundred Years: Hence we may understand that we did not carefully, as it was meet, examine things which we have received from the Roman Church.

Calvin saith, "That Baptism is a form or way of Burial; and none but such as are already dead to Sin, or have repented from dead Works, are to be buried.

From these words I note;

1. That Sprinkling is not the form of Baptism, because not the form of a Burial.

2. That Infants are not the true Subjects of Baptism, because not such as are already dead to Sin, or have repented from dead Works; and indeed as they are not able, they are not required so to do by Christ.

The last Author I shall quote is learned *Zanchy*, "There are two Parts, saith he, in Regeneration, Mortification and Vivification; that is called a Burial with Christ, this (is called) a Resurrection with Christ. The Sacrament of both these is Baptism in which we are overwhelmed, or buried, and after that do come forth and rise again. It may not be said truly, but sacramentally of all that are baptized, that they are buried with Christ, and raised with him, but only of such as have true Faith.

Now we may appeal to all the World, whether *Zanchy* and all the rest do not clearly and evidently testify the same thing that we assert, *viz.* That Baptism is and can be

no

no other Act than Immersion or Dipping, since Sprinkling, all must confess, doth not represent in a lively Figure, the Burial and Resurrection of Christ, nor our dying or being dead to Sin, and Vivification to Newness of Life, saith he, Sacramentally, i. e. Analogically, in respect of the near Resemblance between Baptism, and a Death and Resurrection.

And this, I say, cannot be said of them that are sprinkled only; for if, in respect of Mortification and Vivification, they may be denominated buried and raised with Christ, (which cannot be said of Infants) yet that outward Rite or Sign cannot denominate them so much as Sacramentally buried and raised with Christ: for there is not so much as any likeness of such things in it; but in true Baptism, viz. total dipping the Body in Water, and raising it again, there is a lively Figure held forth to our very sight. And as *Zanchy* saith, " It cannot be said of all, nor " indeed of any, that they are thus sacramentally dead, buried and risen with Christ, but only of such as have true " Faith. Therefore Infants are excluded by his own Argument.

What you say, *that none plant Bodies in Water by baptizing them*, seems strange, and not the words of a learned Man; because dipping is a Figure of planting us into Christ spiritually, and of Christ's Death and Resurrection, must the Body of a Man be a Tree? None graft Bodies into a Vine, yet the grafting of a Person into Christ is represented by that Allusion, or *Metaphorical Expression*: Must the Sign and the Thing signified be all one and the same thing?

Thus we see, in opposition to what you say, in the close of your third Chapter, that it is very plain and manifest, that dipping is absolutely necessary, and of the Essence of Baptism, it's *τὸ εἶναι*. Alas, Sir, in all the New Testament where we read of sprinkling, the Greek (as I said before) renders it *rantizing*, not baptizing: Christ has ordained Rantism, to represent the sprinkling of his Blood, or the sprinkling of his Spirit, prove it; we deny it, and have sufficiently proved he has appointed Baptism to represent his Death, Burial and Resurrection, and that sprinkling is not baptizing. But for a farther Satisfaction of the impartial Reader take a few Syllogistical Arguments.

Arg. 1. If Baptism was ordained to represent the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ in a lively Figure; then Sprinkling cannot be Christ's true Baptism: But Baptism

was

was ordained to represent the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ in a lively Figure ; therefore Sprinkling cannot be Christ's true Baptism.

This Argument we have proved to be true in every part of it.

Arg. 2. If Baptism was appointed to hold forth or represent in a lively Figure the Person's Death to Sin who is baptized, or his present Regeneration, not future, and his rising again to walk in Newness of Life ; then Infants cannot be the Subjects thereof. But Baptism was appointed to hold forth, or represent in a lively Figure the Person's Death to Sin who is baptized, or his present Regeneration, not future, and his rising again to walk in Newness of Life : Therefore Infants are not the Subjects thereof.

4. There is yet one Proof further to make it yet clearer, that Baptism is dipping or plunging, and nothing else, and that is taken from those Typical Baptisms spoken of in the holy Scripture.

(1.) That of the Red Sea, wherein the Fathers were buried as it were unto *Moses* in the Sea, and under the Cloud. See *Pool's* Annotations on the Place.

" Others, says he, (more properly) think the Apostle uses this Term in regard of the great Analogy betwixt Baptism (as it was used) the Person going down into the Waters, and being dipped in them, and the Israelites going down into the Sea, the great Receptacle of Water ; tho the Water at that time was gathered on heaps on the other side of them, yet they seemed buried in the Water, as Persons seem'd buried in the Water were in that Age when they were baptized.

(2.) The second Typical Baptism was that of *Noah's* Ark : See *Sir Norton Knatchbull*, whom I quoted before, saith he, " *Noah's* Ark and Baptism were both a Type and Figure of the Resurrection, not a Sign of the washing away of Sin, tho so taken metonymically, but a particular Signal of the Resurrection of Christ. Of this again, saith he, is Baptism a lively and emphatical Figure, as also was the Ark of *Noah*, out of which he returned, as from a Sepulchre. From hence I infer this Argument following.

Arg. 3. If those Typical Baptisms spoken of in the Scriptures, signified Immersion, or an Overwhelming, or a Burial ; then is Sprinkling no true Baptism : But those
Typical

Typical Baptisms, &c. did signify Immersion, or an Overwhelming, or a Burial; Therefore Sprinkling is no true Baptism.

Again, that Baptism is dipping or plunging, or a being buried in the Water, appears by those Metaphorical Baptisms we read of, which are twofold.

1st. The Baptism of the Holy Spirit.

2dly. The Baptism of Afflictions.

1st. Saith John the Baptist, *I indeed baptize you with Water, but he shall baptize you with the holy Spirit and Fire.* Now 'tis not the sanctifying Gifts of the Spirit which every Godly Person receives, that is the Baptism of the Spirit; but, as the Learned observe, the miraculous Effusions of the holy Spirit, like that at Pentecost, *Acts 1. 4, 5. shall be baptized.* "The Greek word βαπτίζω, saith Casaubon, "is to dip or plunge, &c. in which Sense, saith he, the "Apostles might be truly said to have been baptized; for "the House in which this was done was filled with the "Holy Ghost. So that the Apostles might seem to have "been plunged into it, as in a large Fish-pond. 'Tis not a sprinkling of the Spirit that is the Baptism of the Spirit: for so doubtless the Apostles had the Spirit before they were said to be baptized with it.

Origen on *Acts 2.* saith, "A Wind filled the whole "House that it seem'd like a Fish-pond, because it was "promised to the Apostles, that they should be baptized "with the Holy Ghost.

2dly. We read of the Baptism of Afflictions. I have a Baptism to be baptized with, and how am I straitned till it be accomplished! From the literal Signification of the word *baptizo*, *immergo*, as I shewed before, to plunge under, overwhelm, great Afflictions come to be called Baptism, and signifies, as *Vossius* shews, not every light Affliction, but like that of *David*, *Psal. 32. 6.* he drew me out of the deep Waters. Hence great Afflictions are called Waves; *Thy Waves and thy Billows are gone over me*, *Psal. 42. 7.* 'Tis spoken of Christ's Sufferings, who was as it were drowned, drenched, or overwhelmed in Afflictions and Sufferings: Every small Affliction is not the Baptism of Afflictions, but great and deep Afflictions, suffering even unto Blood and Death.

Pool's Annotations say, to be baptized is to be dipped in Water, metaphorically to be plunged in Afflictions.

I shall close this also with another Argument.

Arg. 4. If those *Metaphorical Baptisms* which we read of in God's Word (as the Baptism of the Spirit, and of Afflictions and Sufferings) are taken from the literal and genuine Signification of the Greek word βαπτίζω *immergo*, which signifies to dip; then sprinkling is not baptizing: but the former is true; *Ergo*, sprinkling is not baptizing.

C H A P. V.

Wherein Mr. Owen's Argument for Infant-Baptism, taken from the Covenant God made with Abraham, is examined, and totally confuted.

S I R,

YOU in your fourth Chapter come to consider and enquire who are the proper Subjects of Baptism, or who they are that ought to be baptiz'd. And first, you say, that Baptism doth not belong to all Men, but to the Faithful and their Seed: *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved*; Mark 16. 16. When the Eunuch ask'd Philip, *See, here is Water, what doth hinder me to be baptized?* He answered, *If thou believest with all thy Heart, thou mayst*; Acts 8. It is plain, say you, that Baptism belongeth to them that believe: but say you, how doth it appear that Baptism doth belong to the Seed of such? that will appear, you say,

1. *From God's Covenant.*
2. *From Circumcision under the Law.*
3. *From Christ's Command to baptize all Nations.*
4. *Because they are holy.*
5. *Because Christ blessed them.*
6. *Because the Gentiles were ingrafted into the Privileges of the Jews.*
7. *Because they can partake of that which is signified by Baptism.*
8. *From the form of Baptism under the Law.*

9. *Be-*

9. *Because John baptized Infants according to the Practice of the Jewish Church.*
10. *Because the Apostles baptized whole Houses.*
11. *Because the Christian Church baptized Infants in every Age.*
12. *Because 'tis a vertuous means to plant the Christian Religion.*

Sir, I shall examine all your Grounds, and answer each of your Arguments in order: And first of all, that of the Covenant with *Abraham*. You argue thus, *viz.* “*Abraham* and his Seed were under the Covenant of Grace, we the Gentiles are a Seed to *Abraham*, and the Covenant of Grace belongeth as extensively unto us as it did to *Abraham*, even to us and to our Children; and if the Children of the Faithful are in the Covenant of Grace, can any Man forbid them the Seal of the Covenant, *viz.* Baptism?”

Ans. 1. I answer, 'tis well, you cannot deny that Baptism belongs to the Faithful, *viz.* to Believers; we then are right who baptize such: and if Faith both in order of Words, and in order of Practice in the Apostolical Days, preceded Baptism, then none but Believers ought to be baptized; but, by your own Confession, Faith both in order of Words and Practice in the Apostolical Days did precede Baptism; 'tis not he that is baptized, and afterwards believes, but contrary ways, he that believeth and is baptized. Faith is required as prerequisite to Baptism, in all that Christ enjoins Baptism upon, which Infants are not capable of.

2. As to your first Argument for Believers Seed to be baptized, from the Covenant made with *Abraham*, I shall shew it is invalid, and will do you no Service.

First, Because there was a twofold Covenant made with *Abraham*, one with his Natural Seed, as such, the other with his true Spiritual, as such: So that what you say that *Abraham* and his Seed were in the Covenant of Grace, *viz.* his Spiritual Seed, is not denied by us; but that all his Natural were in the Covenant of Grace the Apostle denies, and shews the contrary, *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8.

Now if I prove there were two Covenants made with *Abraham*, what is become of all you have said in respect of this matter? And that it is so, let what followeth be considered.

1. We affirm, that the Covenant of Grace and the Covenant of Circumcision made with *Abraham* is not the same or one intire Covenant.

2. We shall consider whether there be the same reason of Circumcision and of Baptism.

1st. We say there was a Covenant of Grace, or Gospel-Covenant made with *Abraham*, and all Believers in him, or all his true Spiritual Seed.

2^{dly}. But the Covenant of Circumcision, or that Covenant God made with his Natural Seed, as such, was a distinct Covenant from the Covenant of Grace; these two Covenants were signified to *Abraham* by *Sarah* and *Hagar*, as the Apostle shews in plain words, *Gal. 4. 24. Which things are an Allegory; for these are the two Covenants, &c.* And now fully and plainly to prove this great Truth, viz. that there were two Covenants made with *Abraham*, take this Argument.

Arg. If the Covenants take their Denomination from the Promises, and the Promises are distinct, viz. some Evangelical, belonging to those that the Gospel belongs unto; and others Domestick or Civil Promises, especially and absolutely respecting the House, and Natural Seed of *Abraham* and Policy of *Israel*; then there were two Covenants made with *Abraham*: but this is so; *Ergo*, &c. To make it clear, and prove it, it is evident that that Promise was Evangelical, belonging to the Gospel-Covenant made with *Abraham*, *Gen. 17. 5. I have made thee a Father of many Nations*: And so is that Promise, *Gen. 15. 5. So shall thy Seed be*: in which it is promised that there shall be of the Nations many, or a great number, that shall be *Abraham's* Spiritual Children by believing, *Rom. 4. 17, 18.* Also it was Evangelical, which we find in *Gen. 12. 3. And in thy Seed shall all the Kindreds of the Earth be blessed.* These tis evident respect all Gospel-Believers, who are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*: See *Gal. 3. 8. And the Scripture foreseeing that God would justify the Heathen through Faith, preached the Gospel to Abraham, saying, In thee shall All the Nations of the Earth be blessed.* And more directly to Christ, who is the Seed of *Abraham*, as *Gal. 3. 16. Now to Abraham and his Seed were the Promises made: He saith not, And to Seeds, as of many, but as of one, and to thy Seed, which is Christ*; that is, to Christ as the Head and Surety of the Covenant of Grace; and so primarily and directly to him, and then in him

him to all who are his, according to that *Gal. 3. 29. And if you be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.* See also *Acts 2. 25.*

2. Moreover, that the Domestick and Civil Promises were many, is plain: As, 1. Of multiplying the Seed of Abraham. 2. The Birth of Isaac. 3. Of the Continuation of the Covenant with Isaac. 4. Of the coming of Christ out of Isaac. 5. The Bondage of the Israelites in Egypt, and their Deliverance out from thence, and of their possessing the Land of Canaan, *Gen. 15. 18. Gen. 17. 8. And I will give unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of Canaan, for an everlasting Possession; and I will be their God. So Gen. 15. 18. In that same day God made a Covenant with Abraham, saying; Unto thy Seed have I given this Land, from the River of Egypt unto the great River Euphrates.* Can you be so ignorant as to affirm, this Covenant-Contract made with Abraham, was made with the Natural Seed of believing Gentiles? Nay, or that it was made to Abraham's Spiritual Seed? Compare these Scriptures with *Acts 7. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.* and thus it appears, the Covenant made with Abraham is a mixt Covenant, or a twofold Covenant, one made with his Natural Seed, the other with his Spiritual Seed: and this is fully signified by Sarah and Hagar, the Free Woman and Bond Woman, and their Sons Isaac and Ishmael, *Gal. 4. 22.*

Secondly; The Seed of Abraham is many ways so called,

1. Christ is called the Seed of Abraham, as I said before, *Gal. 3. 16.* by way of Eminency, as he is the Head, and Surety of the Gospel-Covenant.

2. All the Elect, *Rom. 9. 7.* all Believers, *Rom. 4. 11, 12, 16, 17, 18. Gal. 3. 29. If ye be in Christ, then are ye Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the Promise.*

3. There was a Natural Seed of Abraham, to whom the Inheritance did accrue, this was Isaac, *Gen. 21. 22.*

4. We read of another Natural Seed of Abraham to whom the Inheritance, it is positively said, did not belong, as Ishmael and the Sons of Keturah, *Gen. 15. 5.*

But now can the Infant-Seed of Believers, as such, be said to be the Seed of Abraham in any of these four respects? Add if you can a fifth.

(1.) As the Promise refers to Christ (so they cannot be included) who is Abraham's in a special manner, to whom God promised he would be a God to, and impart all Blessings

Blessings of the Covenant unto, according to that glorious Compact or Covenant of Redemption made between him and the Father before the World began, upon the account of his blessed Undertaking as a Mediator and Surety, that so he might impart all those purchased Blessings and Privileges to all who believe in him, or were given to him by the Father.

(2.) As the Promise refers to the Elect Seed, as such, who had the Faith of *Abraham*, and walk in his Steps, it cannot include the Infant-Seed of believing Gentiles, as such.

(3.) As the Promise refers to *Iaac*, who was *Abraham's* own natural Son according to the Flesh, as well as according to the Promise, they are not the Seed of *Abraham*.

(4.) As *Ishmael* and the Sons of *Keturah* were the Seed of *Abraham*; so the Infant-Seed of believing Gentiles are not the Seed of *Abraham*. If you can add a fifth sort of *Abraham's* Seed (I mean such who are so called) from the Scripture, pray do when you write again.

Arg. From hence I thus argue: If the Children of believing Gentiles, as such, are not the Natural Seed, nor the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, then they can have no right to Baptism or Church-membership, by virtue of any Covenant-Transaction God made with *Abraham*.

But the Children of believing Gentiles, as such, are not the Natural Seed, nor Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*: *Ergo*, They can have no right to Baptism nor Church-Membership, by virtue of any Covenant-Transaction God made with *Abraham*.

It is affirmed by some, that the Children of Believers are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, till they by actual Sin, unrepented of, are otherwise.

Ans. 1. To which I answer. Then some of the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* may perish eternally, and the Promise is not sure to all his Spiritual Seed; It is directly contrary to what *S. Paul* affirms in *Rom. 4. 16. Therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace; to the end the Promise might be sure to all the Seed, not to that only which is of the Law, but to that also which is of the Faith of Abraham, who is the Father of us all.*

From whence I argue:

Arg. 2. All they that are in that Gospel-Covenant which God made with *Abraham*, or who are his true Spiritual Seed,

E

have

have the Promise of Everlasting Life made sure to them: But all the Infant-Seed of Believers, as such, have not the Promise of Everlasting Life made sure to them; *Ergo*, The Infant-Seed of Believers, as such, are not in that Gospel-Covenant God made with *Abraham*, nor his true Spiritual Seed. Take another.

Arg. 3. If all the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* have the Faith of *Abraham*, and walk in the steps of *Abraham*, even that Faith *Abraham* had before he was circumcised; then the Infant-Seed of Believers, as such, are not the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*.

But the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* have the Faith of *Abraham*, and walk in the steps of *Abraham*, even that Faith *Abraham* had before he was circumcised: *Ergo*, The Infant-Seed of Believers, as such, are not the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*.

As to the *Major*, see *Rom. 4. 11, 12.*

The *Minor* cannot be denied: No Man in his right Wits will affirm, the Infants of Believers, as such, have the Faith *Abraham* had before he was circumcised; nor do many of them; nor can they walk in the steps of *Abraham*, having not his Faith.

If any object and say, If Infants of Believers are not included in that Covenant made with *Abraham*, how can any of them who die in their Infancy be saved?

I answer, 1. Cannot God save dying Infants unless they were included in the Covenant made with *Abraham*? How then could the dying Infants of the Godly, who lived before that Covenant was made with *Abraham*, be saved?

God has many ways, through Christ's Undertakings, to save dying Infants, as Dr. *Taylor* notes, which we know not of: Secret things belong to God, and revealed things to us.

2. Were they in any sense included in that Covenant made with *Abraham*, tho not accounted for his Natural or Spiritual Seed, yet it would not follow from thence that they ought to be baptized; because the Females who were truly *Abraham's* Natural Seed, and some of them might be his Spiritual Seed too, yet were not circumcised, no more than the Male Children of the Godly were before *Abraham's* time, &c.

3. Were they in Covenant as they are the Natural Seed of Believers? Then Baptism however does not bring them into the Covenant; and if so, their State is good, whether baptized

baptized or no: And if Baptism brings them into the Covenant of Grace, and makes the Covenant sure unto them, then it would follow that 'tis in the Power of Men, either to bring their Children into the Covenant of Grace, or keep them out; and that it is in effect to say, Parents have Power to save or destroy their Children: and how absurd that is, I will leave to all impartial Men to judg.

I shall, in the next place, prove, that the Covenant of Circumcision was not a Covenant of Grace, or Faith, and therefore doth not concern the Infant-Seed of believing Gentiles.

1. I argue thus: That Covenant that was made to separate the Natural Seed of *Abraham* from all other Nations of the World, and made sure unto them the Earthly Promise of the Possession of the Land of *Canaan*, could not be a Covenant of Grace, which concerns the Infant-Seed of Believers under the Gospel.

But the Covenant of Circumcision was made to separate the Natural Seed of *Abraham* from all other Nations of the World, and made sure unto them the Earthly Promise of the Possession of the Land of *Canaan*: Ergo, The Covenant of Circumcision could not be a Covenant of Grace, which concerns the Infants of Believers under the Gospel.

The *Major* cannot be denied, because the Gospel, or second Covenant is establish'd upon no such Earthly Promises as the Covenant of Circumcision was, nor that we should have an Earthly Kingdom, or possess the Land of *Canaan*; but it is established on better Promises than these, as *Heb.* 8. 6. Also if that Covenant concern'd us, or our Children, who are Gentiles, then the Gentiles had equal Right to that Earthly Inheritance; and then were not the Natural Seed of *Abraham* separated from all other People upon the account of that Earthly Blessing as their Possession only.

As to the *Minor*, see *Gen.* 17. *I will establish my Covenant between me and thee, ver. 7. And I will give unto thee, and thy Seed after thee, the Land wherein thou art a Stranger, all the Land of Canaan for an everlasting Possession; and I will be thy God, ver. 8. This is my Covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee; every Man-Child among you shall be circumcised, ver. 10.*

1st. There were some who were circumcised, to whom the Promise of the Gospel-Covenant God made with *Abraham* did not belong, as *Ishmael, Esau, &c.* God expressly

said, that his Covenant (*i. e.* the Covenant of Grace) was not establish'd with *Ishmael*, but with *Isaac*, and yet the Covenant of Circumcision belonged to *Ishmael* as well as to *Isaac*. See *Gen. 17. 20, 21.* *As for Ishmael, I have heard thee: behold, I have blessed him, &c. But my Covenant will I establish with Isaac, whom Sarah shall bear unto thee, &c.* Compare this with *Rom. 7. 8, 9.* *Not because they are the Seed of Abraham, are they all Children: that is, Children of the Covenant of Grace, or the Children of God; but the Children of the Promise are counted for thy Seed: See Gal 4. 29, 30.* Nay, all that were in *Abraham's* House, whether born there or Strangers, or such who were bought with his Money, were circumcised: But will you say, all these were in the Gospel-Covenant God made with him?

Moreover, there were other Persons in *Abraham's* House, who no doubt might some of them be in the Covenant of Grace, and had the Promises belonging to them, who were nevertheless not circumcised, namely, the Females; also Male-Infants dying before the eighth day coming from *Abraham*: Moreover, other Godly Men who were not of *Abraham's* Family, yet lived in his time, as *Melchisedec, Lot, Job* &c, none of these had right to be circumcised. But if any object, and say, the Females were circumcised in the Males: I answer with *Mr. Tombs*, it is without Proof; and by like, nay perhaps greater Reason it may be said, that the Children of Believers are baptized in the Persons of their Parents, and therefore are not to be baptized in their own Persons. Also 'tis apparent that the Jews comprehended in that Covenant made with *Abraham*, and circumcised accordingly, were nevertheless not admitted to Baptism upon that foot of account; which, had the Covenant of Circumcision been a Gospel-Covenant, *i. e.* of the same nature, I see no Reason why *John Baptist* should deny their Argument, *i. e.* We are *Abraham's* Seed, &c. Hence it plainly appears, that the right Evangelical Promises were not the adequate Reason of Circumcision; but, as I have before said, the Precept or express Command of God to *Abraham*. And from hence I shall infer this third Argument.

Arg. 3. That Covenant that was made with, or did belong unto the Fleishy Seed of *Abraham*, and ungodly ones as well as the godly, was not a Covenant of Grace, or Gospel-Covenant.

But the Covenant of Circumcision was made with, or did belong to the Fleſhly Seed of *Abraham*, as *Iſhmael*, *Eſau*, and all the Lineal Seed of *Abraham*, who were ungodly, as well as to the godly: *Ergo*, The Covenant of Circumciſion was not a Covenant of Grace, or Goſpel-Covenant.

Arg. 4 It all who are in the Covenant of Grace, or Goſpel-Covenant, do know the Lord from the greateſt to the leaſt of them; then the Covenant of Circumciſion could not be the Covenant of Grace, or Goſpel-Covenant.

But all who are in the Covenant of Grace, or Goſpel-Covenant, do know the Lord from the greateſt to the leaſt of them: *Ergo*, The Covenant of Circumciſion was not the Covenant of Grace.

This Argument is fully proved by that in *Jer. 31. 32, 33, 34* ſpeaking of the new Covenant which God would make with the Houſe of *Iſrael*, which ſhould not be according to the old, he goes on and tells us what God would do in the Goſpel-day. That he would put his Law into their inward Parts, and write it in their Hearts. And they ſhall teach no more every Man his Neighbour, and every Man his Brother, ſaying, Know the Lord; for they ſhall all know me, from the leaſt of them unto the greateſt of them, ſaith the Lord, &c.

And indeed in this very reſpect the Goſpel-Covenant is not according to the old, as the Lord ſaid it ſhould not be, as well as in divers other caſes: For many of thoſe who were in the old Covenant (to which Circumciſion did appertain) were Infants, though all of them were not taken in by Circumciſion; for Female Infants were received into that old Covenant without it. Now theſe Children who were taken into Covenant, did not know the Lord: Infants having no Underſtanding, know not their Right-hand from their Left, it is therefore impoſſible they ſhould know the Lord; and therefore there was a neceſſity, after they were in that Covenant, that they ſhould be taught to know the Lord: Firſt, That God is, and what a God he is, and ſo to know him as to fear him, and ſerve him in Sincerity.

But in the Goſpel-Covenant God promiſed it ſhould be otherwiſe, all who were received into that Covenant ſhould be Adult Perſons, or ſuch who did know the Lord: which plainly implies no ignorant Infant ſhould be taken into that Covenant, and be a Member of that Church-State; for it

so, then it would follow, such would have the like need to be taught to know the Lord, as they had in the old Covenant Church-State. And remarkable it is, that this Text doth clearly intimate, that all who should be taken into the Gospel-Covenant, or Gospel Church, should be disciplined or taught, first to know God; for to be taught or disciplined is all one and the same thing, which agrees with Christ's great Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. where he gave Directions who, or what kind of Persons they were to be that he would have his Apostles receive into his Gospel-Church; and that they should be all of them, first taught, or made Disciples, and, as such, be baptized, is clearly declared. Now that this Text in *Jer.* 31. refers to the Gospel-Covenant is evident. see *Heb.* 8. 7, 8, 9, 10.

Arg. 5. That Covenant that was a part or branch of the old Covenant, or Covenant of Works, was not a Covenant of Grace, or Gospel-Covenant.

But the Covenant of Circumcision was a part or branch of the old Covenant, or Covenant of Works; *Ergo*, The Covenant of Circumcision was not a Covenant of Grace, or Gospel-Covenant.

The *Major* cannot be denied.

The *Minor* is easily proved. That which bound or obliged all those who were under it, or did it, to keep the whole Law, and was also abrogated, or taken away by Christ, with all the other Rites and Shadows of the old Covenant, was a part or branch of the said old Covenant. But Circumcision bound or obliged all who were circumcised to keep the whole Law, and also the same Rite of Circumcision was abrogated, with all other Rites and Shadows of the old Covenant by Christ: *Ergo*, Circumcision was a part or branch of the old Covenant; see *Gal.* 5. 3. *I testify to every Man that is circumcised, that he is a Debtor to keep the whole Law.*

Arg. 6. The Covenant which was in its nature and quality as much a Covenant of Works, as that made with Adam, or the Sinai-Covenant, was not a Covenant of Grace, or Gospel-Covenant, whereof Christ is the Mediator.

But the Covenant of Circumcision was in its nature and quality as much a Covenant of Works, as that Covenant made with Adam, or the Sinai-Covenant: *Ergo*, The Covenant of Circumcision was not a Covenant of Grace, or Gospel-Covenant. Read Reverend Mr. Philip Cary's Defence and Proof

Proof of the Substance of this Argument, in his just Reply to Mr. *John Flavel*, p. 59, 60. Thus he says (and doubtless speaks the Truth) *viz.*

“ That Adam’s Covenant was a Covenant of Works, cannot rationally be denied; for as much as Life was implicitly promised to him on his Obedience, and Death was explicitly threatened in case of Disobedience; upon these Terms he was to stand or fall. And that the *Sinai*-Covenant was of the same nature, he hath in the said Treatise clearly proved, both of them requiring perfect Obedience, and neither of them admitting of Faith in a Redeemer. The *Sinai* Covenant commanded perfect Obedience under the pain of a Curse; *Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things that are written in the Book of the Law, to do them; Gal. 3. 10.*

It accepted (as he shews) of no short Endeavours, nor gave any Strength, and is called a Ministration of Death and of Condemnation, *2 Cor. 3.* And moreover ’tis called in express Terms, the old Covenant which God made with the Children of *Israel* when he brought them up out of the Land of *Egypt*, *Heb. 8. 9.* Also the new Covenant is said to be directly contrary unto it, or not according to it, but opposed thereto, and that there was no Righteousness by it, nor Life: for, as the Apostle shews, if there had, Christ is dead in vain; and besides, the Apostle says ’tis done away. Now all these things being considered, Mr. *Flavel* ’tis evident doth but beat the Air, and darken Counsel; and all that he hath said in his last Book in Answer to that worthy Gentleman Mr. *Cary*, deserves no farther Answer.

“ Now, saith he, that the Covenant of Circumcision is of the same stamp, is evident: for tho God promised to be a God to *Abraham* and to his Seed, *Gen. 17. 7, 8.* as he did also in the *Sinai*-Covenant to the same People in the Wilderness; yet still it was on condition of Obedience, with an answerable Threatning in case of Disobedience; *Ver. 9, 10. Thou shalt keep my Covenant therefore, thou, and thy Seed after thee, in their Generations. This is my Covenant, which ye shall keep between me and you, and thy Seed after thee: Every Man-Child shall be circumcised. Ver. 14. The uncircumcised Male Child, whose Flesh of his Foreskin is not circumcised, that Soul shall be cut off from his People: he hath broken my Covenant.* The same Terms, saith he, with the former. Besides, ’tis evident that

“ Circumcision indispensably oblig’d all that were under it
 “ to a perfect universal Obedience to the whole revealed
 “ Will of God, as I hinted before, *Gal. 5. 3.*

And as the Terms were the same, so were the Promises; that which was the great Promise of the Covenant of Circumcision, as the Land of *Canaan*, and God to be their God, in fulfilling that Earthly Promise to *Abraham’s* Natural Seed, upon the Condition of keeping that Covenant on their parts.

That which *Mr. Flavel* hath said in his last Reply (in his Book, call’d, *A succinct and seasonable Discourse*) to *Mr. Cary*, is mainly to prove that there is but one Covenant of Works. p. 217, 218, &c.

To which I answer by way of Concession; yet you must say, that Covenant had several Ministrations, and Additions, as had also the Covenant of Grace; because the Covenant of Works was made with *Adam*, by which he stood in the time of his Innocency justified and accepted by virtue thereof.

Could not God give such a second Ministration or Transcript of his righteous and holy Law, tho’ not to Justification, yet to aggravate his Sin, and to his just Condemnation? And doth not *St. Paul* assert the same thing? *Rom. 3. 19, 20.* compared with *Rom. 7. 13.* That Sin by the Commandment (or Law) might become exceeding sinful: So *Gal. 3. 19.* Nay, I will affirm, always when the Scriptures of the New Testament speak of the old Covenant, or first Covenant, or Covenant of Works, it passes by in silence the Covenant made with *Adam*, and more immediately and directly applies to the *Sinai* Covenant, and to the Covenant of Circumcision, as all careful Readers, who read the Epistles to the *Romans*, *Galatians*, and to the *Hebrews*, may clearly find. But to proceed; Tho’ we say there is but one Covenant of Grace, yet it is evident there were several distinct Ministrations of it, or Additions to it; and we say, the Promise of the Gospel, or Gospel-Covenant, was the same in all Ages, in respect of things promised, with the nature and quality thereof, which is a free and absolute Covenant, without Works, or any Conditions or foreseen Acts of Righteousness, or any thing to be done by the Creature, *Rom. 4. 5.* The Substance and Essential Part of this Covenant is Christ. Faith, a new Heart, Regeneration, Remission of Sins, Sanctification, Preservation,

servation, and Everlasting Life. Yet this Evangelical Covenant had divers Forms or Transcripts of it, which signified those things, and various Sanctions by which it was given forth and confirmed. To *Adam* the Promise was made, under the Name of the Seed of the Woman bruising the Head of the Serpent; to *Enoch*, *Noah*, &c. in other Forms; to *Abraham*, under the Name of his Seed, in whom all the Nations of the Earth should be blessed; to *Moses*, by the Name of a great Prophet of his Brethren like unto him; and it was also signified to him under dark Shadows and Sacrifices: unto *David* under the Name of a Successor in his Kingdom: In the New Testament in plain words, *We all, with open face, beholding as in a Glass the Glory of the Lord*; 2 Cor. 3. 18.

But now, because there were so many Additions of the Gospel-Promise and new Covenant, are there so many new Covenants? This being so, Mr. *Flavel* hath done nothing to remove Mr. *Cary's* Arguments, but they stand as a Rock. Take another of them.

Arg. 7. That Covenant in which Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteousness, could not be a Gospel-Covenant, or a Covenant of Grace:

But the Scripture is express, that Faith was not reckoned to *Abraham* for Righteousness when he was circumcised, but in Uncircumcision, *Rom. 4. 9, 10.*

Ergo, The Covenant of Circumcision was not a Gospel-Covenant, or a Covenant of Grace.

Arg. 8. That Law or Covenant which is contradistinguished, or opposed to the Righteousness of Faith, could not be a Covenant of Faith, or a Gospel-Covenant.

But the Law or Covenant of Circumcision is, by the Apostle plainly opposed to, or contradistinguished unto the Righteousness of Faith, *Rom. 4. 13.*

Ergo, The Law or Covenant of Circumcision was not a Gospel-Covenant. And from hence Mr. *Cary* argues thus, "By the way, saith he, let it be observed, in reference to the two foregoing Arguments which I have already proved, that that Covenant that is not of Faith, must be a Covenant of Works, there being no Medium betwixt them, and consequently must be the same for Substance with that made with *Adam*, and that on Mount *Sinai* with the Children of *Israel*."

Arg. 9. That Covenant that is plainly represented to us in Scripture as a Bondage-Covenant, in and by which there was imposed such a Yoke upon the Necks of the Jews, which neither those in the Apostles time, nor their Fathers were able to bear, could be no other than a Covenant of Works, and not of Grace.

But the Scriptures do plainly represent such was the nature of the Covenant of Circumcision, *Acts 15. 10. Gal. 5. 1, 2, 3.* *Ergo,* The Covenant of Circumcision was not a Gospel-Covenant, but a Covenant of Works. Thus Mr. *Cary* argues also: And thus we have proved from God's Word, and sound Arguments, that the Covenant of Circumcision was not a Gospel-Covenant.

Objeſt. But lest any should think that we shut out all dying Infants from having any Benefit by Christ.

Anſw. I answer, I doubt not but God might comprehend them in that glorious Covenant or Compact made between him and our Surety in the Covenant of Redemption: But, as I said before, secret things belong to God.

But let me here add one word or two further, *i. e.* Circumcision, you say, was a Privilege: so we say too, but not such a Privilege as you do imagine.

1. It doth profit as a Privilege, because it was given as a Token or a Sign to *Abraham's* Natural Seed, that they should have the Land of *Canaan* for an everlasting Possession.

2. As a Token or Sign to them of the giving forth of the Law on Mount *Sinai*. He dealt his Laws and Statutes to *Israel*, he did not so to any other Nation; this Rite could not therefore be a Gospel-Rite, nor the Covenant it was a Sign of a Gospel-Covenant, in which the Gentile Christians are concern'd. And thus *Paul* argues, *Rom. 3. 1. What Advantage then hath the Jew? or what Profit is there in Circumcision? Ver. 2. Much every way; chiefly, because unto them were committed the Oracles of God.* You may soon know the nature of that Covenant made with *Abraham's* Natural Seed, and of Circumcision which was a Sign of it; the chiefest Privilege which attended it, was the giving to them, *i. e.* the People of *Israel*, the Law of the Ten Commandments.

3. Circumcision, by the Doctrine of *St. Paul*, was a Privilege if they kept the Law: For Circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keepest the Law; but if thou be a Breaker of the Law, thy Circumcision is made Uncircumcision, or a Nullity, and profiteth

profiteeth thee nothing ; that is, if thou keep not the Law perfectly. And thus speak our late Annotators on the place, " If thou [Jew] keep the Law perfectly, to which Circumcision obligeth, *Gal. 5. 3.* If otherwise thou transgresseth the Law, thy Circumcision availeth thee nothing, it gives thee no Privilege above the uncircumcised. What is now become (this being so) of that mighty Privilege *Abraham's Seed* (as such) had by Circumcision, if the chief Profit or Privilege was, because unto them the Land should be given, which could not give Life, but was a Covenant of Works? then the chiefest Profit lay not in it, as it was an Ordinance of Initiation into the Church: sure, had *Paul* been of the Judgment of Pedo-baptists, he would have rather past by that Privilege, when he spoke of Circumcision, which he calls the chief, and have said, chiefly in that it was a Seal of Church-Membership. But since he speaks the quite contrary, who shall we believe, you, or the great Apostle of the Gentiles? And evident it is, he confirms the same Doctrine, *Gal. 3. 3. For I testify to every Man that is circumcised, that he is a Debtor to keep the whole Law.* And hence 'tis said to be a Yoke of Bondage which neither they nor their Fathers could bear, *Acts 15.* because it obliged them to universal Obedience, or to keep the Law perfectly, and brought them under a Curse if they did not, *Gal. 3. 10.*

These things considered, fully shew of what stamp and nature Circumcision was, together with that Covenant to which it did appertain.

You say the Covenant made with *Abraham* did include Spiritual Blessings.

And I grant the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* principally included Spiritual Blessings ; but the Covenant with his Natural Seed, as such, did not include Spiritual Blessings : All Spiritual Blessings are made in Christ, and to none but to the Elect in him. Moreover, we deny not but the Covenant of Circumcision was made as well with *Abraham's* Spiritual Seed that sprang from his Loins, as unto his Carnal Seed ; and so Circumcision and the Land of *Canaan* were of use to his Spiritual Seed, as the one typified the Circumcision of the Heart, and the other the Celestial Rest.

" You say that Infants were always in the Covenant of Grace ; and to prove it, you mention *Act. 2. 38, 39. Repent,*
" and

“ and be baptized every one of you, &c. For the Promise is to you, and to your Children, &c.

Ans. Do we deny that the Promise of Pardon and of the holy Spirit doth belong to our Children or Off-spring that do believe, or are called by the Lord? We grant it readily, but we do deny that this Promise here refers to our Seed, as such. Dr. Taylor, late Bishop of Down, on this Text says, “ And to your Children, that is, to you
“ and to your Posterity, to you and to your Children,
“ when they are of the same Capacity in which you are,
“ effectually receptive of the Promise; but (*saith he*) if
“ whenever the word [Children] is used in Scripture, we
“ should by Children understand Infants, we must believe
“ that in all Israel there were no Men, but all were Infants;
“ and if that had been true, it had been the greater Wonder they should overcome the *Anakims*, and beat the King
“ of *Moab*, and march so far, and discourse so well, for
“ they were all called the Children of Israel.

“ The Promise appertains not to Infants in that Capacity and Consistence, but only by the Title of their being Reasonable Creatures, and when they come to act Faith, of which by Nature they have the Faculty. If it did, yet Baptism (*saith he*) is not the Means of conveying the Holy Ghost; for when Peter says, Repent and be baptized, and ye shall receive the holy Spirit, it signifies no more than this; First, Be baptized, and then by Imposition of Hands, &c. which was another Mystery and Rite, ye shall receive the Promise of the Father, &c. But then, *saith he*, from hence to argue, that wherever there is a Capacity of receiving the same Grace, there also the same Sign is to be administered, and from hence to infer Pædo-baptism, is an Argument very fallacious, upon several Grounds. 1. Because Baptism is not the Sign of the Holy Ghost, but by another Mystery, it was conveyed ordinarily and extraordinarily, (that is, by laying on of Hands, as the Doctor mentioned before). 2. If the Supposition were true, the Proposition built upon it is false; for, *saith he*, they that were capable of the same Grace, are not always capable of the same Sign; for Women under the Law of *Moses*, altho they were capable of the Righteousness of Faith, yet they were not capable of the Sign of Circumcision; for God doth not always convey his Grace in the same manner.

Thus

Thus far Reverend Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, Lib. of Proph. p. 234, 235.

For what the Bishop hath said answers all you affirm on this Text for Infants Baptism. The Promise of the Spirit we grant runs to Believers, and to all their believing Seed and Off-spring, be they Jews or Gentiles; and this Text proves nothing more. It did not belong to the Jews Seed, as such, but only to their Children that did believe, and so it doth to the Gentiles, that were sometimes afar off, that believe, and to their Children that God shall also call, as he doth call their Parents.

That which you seem to affirm from this Text is this, *viz.* that there is such a Covenant made with Gentile Believers, and with every particular Believer, and his Carnal Seed, as God made with *Abraham*, which is strange Divinity. We have proved that there was a Covenant of Peculiarity made with *Abraham* and his *Natural Seed*, to which Circumcision did belong, and by virtue of that Covenant, as appertaining to the Flesh. There was under the Law a *knowing of Men*, the Jews in that Legal and External Covenant had the *Preferencē* above the Gentiles; but that Covenant is taken away, and that Partition-Wall is pulled down, and now the Jews have no Advantage upon that account above the Gentiles, or the Gentiles above the Jews, *old things being passed away*, and old Church-State and Church-Membership gone; so that all you say upon this Scripture and Argument signifies nothing.

And remarkable 'tis that *Peter* spake these words to the Jews, *The Promise is to you and your Children*, &c. But to say, the Promise runs to them and to their Infants, as to Baptism and Church-Membership under the Gospel, as Circumcision and Legal Church-Membership did under the Law, is notoriously false; none of the Jews Children were allowed Baptism, or received into the Gospel-Church, but only such that did believe, nor of the Gentiles neither; when their Children believe, or are called, then they may be baptized, and they have right to the Promise of the holy Spirit.

The Promise and Blessing of *Abraham*, you say, comes on the Gentiles through Christ, and by Faith, therefore, say I, not in a fleshly Line, and by Birth-Privilege

“ You say, *Abraham's* Blessing was not Personal unto him and unto his Seed, this Blessing came upon the
“ believing

“believing Gentiles, therefore, say you, it must come on the Faithful, and on their Seed; for it cannot be termed *Abraham's* Blessing if it come not upon the Gentiles in an essential form to *Abraham's* Covenant; that is, I will be a God unto thee, and to thy Seed, unless this Blessing come upon the Gentiles in the same manner, and in the same Enlargement, it being not *Abraham's* Blessing, but a part of it, being cut in the middle. I will be a God to you Gentiles, but not to your Seed; is this *Abraham's* Blessing, how unlike to it? there is a great difference between an Estate settled on a real Man, and that being also settled on his Children.

Ans. 1. You talk as if you were ignorant what *Abraham's* Blessing was, the Blessing of *Abraham* was not the External Privileges of the Covenant of Grace (which it seems is all you plead for about your Infant Seed) but the spiritual Part and Blessing of the Covenant, namely, *Justification, Pardon of Sin, Adoption, and Eternal Life.*

2. As to *Abraham's* Seed, doth not the Apostle tell you, that, *To Abraham and to his Seed the Promise was made: He saith not, to Seeds, as of many, but to thy Seed, which is Christ*; Gal. 3. 16. Now you contend for Seeds, as of many, even to all the fleshly Seed of *Abraham*, and fleshly Seed of all Believers. Sir, no Gentiles but such as are Christ's, are *Abraham's* Seed; none but such that believe, and have *Abraham's* Faith.

The Inheritance, which is *God to be our God by way of special Interest*, is settled upon all Believers, and their Children that have the same Faith, not their Carnal Seed as such, but only God's Elect Ones.

3. I have proved (it is true) that there was a Legal and External Covenant made with *Abraham*, and his Fleshly Seed, in which Covenant God was said to be the God of the whole House of *Israel*, and was bound to them; but that Covenant is abolished, and the new Covenant is not according to that, but quite different, the Fleshly Seed are not in a Relative External Covenant: Now Christ's Gospel-Church is not National. This being considered, it appears, that what you say concerning *Abraham* being the Father of the Gentiles, signifies nothing for your purpose; for he was not the Father of any Gentiles, but of such that believe in Christ, or Elect Ones; and this you seem to acknowledge in these words, *viz.* the believing Gentiles are a Seed to

Abraham, Gal. 3. 29. But, Sir, what's this to the Business? prove if you can, that the fleshly Seed of Gentile Believers, as such, are a Seed to *Abraham*, for 'tis that which we utterly deny, and on that foot of account the whole Controversy depends. " You say the Children of the Flesh are " not accounted to be the Children of God, when they " break their Covenant with God; and *John Baptist* calleth " such a Generation of Vipers.

Ans. 1. This is the sense of the Apostle, strange! Can those that are the Children of the Covenant of Grace, cease to be such? May the Children of God degenerate into Dogs, Wolves, and Vipers? I thought that such as are God's Children, or Heirs according to the promised Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, can never cease being the Children of God; how else is the Promise sure to all *Abraham's* Spiritual Seed? Do not all the Children of God partake of God's Divine Nature, and are not they all Heirs of God? Are you an Arminian? Do you plead for final falling out of God's Covenant, or from a State of true Grace? that must follow what you say here, or your Argument is gone and lost for ever.

2. Reader, 'tis plain that *Ishmael, Esau, &c.* and many more of *Abraham's* Natural Seed, nay all, as such, or as so simply considered, were not accounted for his Spiritual Seed; or the Children of God, but only such that are God's Elect Ones, or such as believe in Christ: and 'tis plain that none of the true Children of God can degenerate so as to cease being his Children; I mean, they cannot fall totally and finally from a State of Grace, and become Vipers, &c. as *Mr. Owen* acknowledges some of *Abraham's* Seed did, which clearly shews that those Jews never were in the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*; " But, say you, " they were nevertheless in the outward Dispensation of " God's Covenant, &c.

Ans. 1. True, the Privileges of *Abraham's* Natural Seed, as such, were great, as to outward Rite and Prerogatives; the Covenant did appertain to them [mark it!] (Covenants) there were two Covenants, 'tis not said Covenant, 1. They had right to all the External Privileges of the Legal Covenant; and the outward Dispensation of the Gospel, and Adoption by Faith was first to be offered unto them, but neither they nor their Children, as such, had right to Justification, Adoption, &c. or any outward Rite or Sacrament of

of the Gospel ; no, not until they did believe, and had the things signified in the Sacrament. But,

2. That Covenant that gave Abraham's Natural Seed, as such, a Prerogative above the Gentiles, was that *Partition-Wall* that is now broken down, (*ut antea*) i. e. that Covenant is abolished, and Jews and Gentiles stand now upon equal ground ; here are not fleshly Privileges now that one hath above the other ; *no knowing of Men nor things after the Flesh, or by Birth in a fleshly way*, through or by reason of an External Covenant, as under the Law. You argue as many Pædo-baptists have done before you, Children of Believers were once in Covenant, who dares be so bold as to say they are cast out ?

Ans. 1. Infants being once Members of the Jewish Church doth not prove they were ever Members of the Gospel Church : The Male Infants of God's Priests under the old Covenant, when grown up, had other Privileges, if we must call Circumcision a Privilege, which the Sons of Christ's Ministers have no right to under the Gospel, and yet no where in express words in the New Testament excluded from that Privilege.

2. But I have proved the Covenant for Infants Incovenanting under the Law, was no Gospel-Covenant, and so concern not our Infants.

3. According to that Maxim, *Omnis privatio intimat habitum* ; you know that every Dispossession implieth a Possession : Infants therefore cannot be cast out of the Gospel-Church, before they can be proved they were admitted. If you or any Man living can tell us in what visible Administration children were admitted Church Members before Abraham's days, which was above 2000 Years, you say somewhat : you affirm they were always in Covenant.

Mr. Sidenham makes mention of a twofold Covenant. 1. In relation to Election. 2. To be in Covenant *in facie visibilis Ecclesie*. To this I answer ; The Covenant of Circumcision belonged to the Children of the Flesh, to *Ishmael*, and *Esau*, as well as *Jacob*, who were not in the Election of Grace : therefore all those who were circumcised were not so in Covenant. Children of Unbelievers may be in that sense in Covenant as well as Children of Believers, as many of them afterwards prove to be, nay may be more of them than of the Children of Believers.

2. As touching Infants being in Covenant *in facie visibilis Ecclesie*, in the face of a visible Church. I answer; Tho they were so in all the Jewish Churches under the old Covenant, some with Circumcision were brought in, and some without it; yet that Covenant and Covenant-Seed are (as I have and shall yet prove) cast out, which will be a final Answer.

Thus I argue;

If the Covenant for incovenanting of Infants was the old Covenant signified by *Hagar*, and that Covenant-Seed signified by *Ishmael* are cast out; then the Natural or Fleshly Seed of Believers are cast out, or not to be admitted into the Gospel-Church.

But the Covenant for incovenanting of Infants was the old Covenant signified by *Hagar*, and that Covenant-Seed signified by *Ishmael* are cast out.

Ergo, The Natural or Fleshly Seed of Believers are cast out, or not to be admitted into the Gospel-Church. See *Gal. 4. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26.* For it is written that Abraham had two Sons, the one by a Bond-woman, the other by a Free-woman. Ver. 24. Which things are an Allegory; for these are the two Covenants; the one from Mount Sinai, which gendereth to Bondage, which is *Hagar*; &c. Ver. 30. Nevertheless, what saith the Scripture? Cast out the Bond-woman and her Son; for the Son of the Bond-woman shall not be Heir with the Son of the Free-woman.

1. By *Hagar* is meant, all agree, the old Covenant; and by casting her out, is held forth the abolishing, or taking away of the old Covenant. *He took away the first, that he might establish the second*; Heb. 10. 9.

2. By *Ishmael* is meant the Natural Seed of Abraham, and so the Natural Seed of all Godly Men of his Race that succeeded him, who were Members of that Church. And as the late Annotators note, by this place is signified the total Destruction of the Jewish Church, which consisted of Parents and their Children, or the whole Nation of *Israel*. This Church and Church-Seed, and manner of Church-Membership is cast out and gone for ever.

We say that Children were once admitted Members of the Jewish Church; but evident it is, that God hath now quite pulled down, and razed that House to the Foundation thereof, I mean that National Church of the Jews, and broke up House-keeping, and turned the Bond-woman and
F her

her Son, *i. e.* the Fleſhly Seed or Natural Off-ſpring of *Abraham*, out of Doors; the natural Branches are broken off, and God hath now built him a new and more glorious, and Spiritual Houſe under the Goſpel, into which he admitted none as his Houſhold Servants, to dwell in this his Spiritual Family, or Goſpel Church, but Believers only, or ſuch as profeſs themſelves ſo to be. *Ye, ſaith St. Peter, as lively Stones are built up a ſpiritual Houſe, &c.* and that the old Houſe, the Jewish Church-ſtate, with all the Appurtenances, Rites and Privileges of it are aboliſhed, or pulled down, and a new own built and ſet up, into which Infants are not to be admitted, is very evident: *Heb. 7. 12. For the Priethood being changed, there is made of neceſſity a Change alſo of the whole Law*, which muſt needs include Circumciſion, with all Appurtenances and Privileges belonging to it. And therefore as Infant Church-Membership came in with the Law of Circumciſion, and as a direct part of the old Covenant or old Law; ſo likewiſe plain it is that it went out, and was diſannulled with it.

Take again my former Simily, *viz.* What Privileges ſoever are given to any Perſon by an Act of Parliament, which ſaid Law was to continue ſo long in force and no longer, than when that time was expired; and another Parliament makes a new Law, where many things are contained that were in the laſt Law, but thoſe divers Privileges given to thoſe Perſons in the former Law are left out in this latter Act: would it not be a piece of Folly for any of them to plead thoſe Privileges by virtue of a Law that is gone, and now not in any force? But to come a little nearer the caſe in a more apt Simily: Suppoſe a Man ſhould have a Legacy bequeathed to him by the Will and Teſtament of his Friend, and yet afterwards his Friend ſees good to make another Will, which is his laſt Will and Teſtament, and in this laſt Will and Teſtament he leaves him quite out, not mentioning his Name, bequeathing no ſuch Legacy to him; would it not be Folly in him to ſue for that Legacy left him in the firſt Will and Teſtament?

Sir, the Caſe is thus in hand, we read of two Covenants or Teſtaments, an old and a new, a firſt and a ſecond. Now in the old Will or old Teſtament, Infants were admitted to this Privilege of Church-Membership in that Legal or National Church of the Jews; and National Church-Privileges are now made null and void by the Goſpel-Covenant, which

which is Christ's last Will and Testament, in which Infant Church-Membership is quite left out, their Names not being mentioned, as having right to any Gospel-Ordinance, as Baptism, the Lord's-Supper, &c.

If we would know the Mind of God herein, we must of necessity have recourse to Christ's last Will and Testament. Since the Gospel is so called, and that the first or old one is taken away, and there is no Man can prove any one old Rite that did appertain to the Natural Off-spring of *Abraham*, or Believers, remains to them, which is not mentioned in the new or last Will or Testament of Jesus Christ; 'tis plain they had (or leastwise some of them) other external Privileges besides that of Circumcision, and yet I see no Man contend for any one Rite, but only this they call the Seal of the Covenant. Why might not Ministers plead for all their Sons to have right to the Ministry, since that Privilege was given them in the Old Testament; and that all Male-Children that open the Womb to be holy to the Lord, which Blessings belonged to them under the Law, and also plead for the Tithes and First-fruits? &c.

I desire you and all Pedit-baptists carefully to consider and weigh what I have said; I have shew'd you and them how Infants, who were once in Covenant, *i. e.* in the Jewish or old Covenant, are cast out, or left out; for indeed they were never admitted into the New Testament-Church; but since they are not put in, and the old Covenant, and old Church-Membership are cast out and gone, in vain it is for any to plead their Right by an abrogated Law. Besides,

You say, Circumcision was the Seal of that Covenant, by virtue of which Infants had Right to Church Membership: if so, 'tis evident that Covenant is gone, because 'tis cancelled; for the tearing off, or breaking off the Seal, we all look upon as cancelling a Covenant.

That Circumcision (the Seal as you call it) is broken off, I am sure you cannot deny; Sir, what is then become of your Covenant for incovenanting Children?

Object. But may be you will object and say, that you do not contend for that particular Rite or Institution of a visible Church-Membership of Infants, perpetual in all Ages, and an indefinite Seal.

Reply 1. How doth it appear the Infants of the Godly before *Abraham's* time, had any Right to visible Church-Membership, or what Seal had they?

2. Such a Right is a meer Figment-like *Idea Platonica*. All Institutions meerly positive are of such Rite in particular, and an initial Seal is meerly positive, as Signs that are not natural, but by the Will of the Appointer; and therefore there is no initial Seal indefinite.

Sir, now you have no way left, but to see since the old Covenant is cancelled, whether you can find the Baptism of Infants in the New Testament, and there taught, laid down and prefix'd to it, as Circumcision was to the Old? Do that and you do all; do not that, and all you do is just nothing. You with others seem to say that the Privileges of the Gospel are straiter and narrower than those of the Law.

Ans. If you once imagine, that the outward or external Privileges of the Gospel are larger, or so large as those were under the Law, you are greatly mistaken. The Jews and Jewish Teachers or Priests had many external Privileges, which Christians and Ministers under the Gospel have not; they had a lovely Country promised to them, *a Land that flowed with Milk and Honey*: outward Peace, Riches, and gathering of Wealth, where Privileges belonged to them; but we under the Gospel have no such Privileges, but are to expect Persecution, and what not? Yet our Privileges are better and greater, tho more spiritual; 'tis a *Covenant established upon better Promises*: Our Children, when grown up, sit under the clear and glorious Light of the Gospel, which they and theirs then held forth but in dark Shadows.

Moreover, then the Church-state was confined to the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, &c. but now all in all Nations who repent and believe the Gospel; the poor Gentiles are now become fellow-Heirs indeed. Our spiritual Privileges do infinitely excel theirs, but not in Externals; now are greater Infusions of the Holy Spirit.

O, Sir, what Privileges had the Gentiles or their Children then! is not the case mended with us?

Again, 'tis objected by some Pedit-baptists, "If it were the Will of God, Infants under the Gospel should be reckoned as out of his Covenant who were in Covenant, then it follows, say they, that our Saviour was unfaithful, or forgetful to his Church, in that he never acquainted her with this Alteration; but not one word by way of Prohibition do we find in all the New Testam-

ment:

“ ment: from whence we may conclude, that Christ’s nor
 “ repealing the Practice of initiating Infants, nor forbid-
 “ ding their Admission into the Church by Baptism, &c.

Ans. 1. I answer, Had it been the Will of God that Infants should under the Gospel be admitted into the Church by Baptism, Christ, you might rather say, had been forgetful or unfaithful in not giving the least Intimation of his Mind and Pleasure therein, who declared all things plainly from the Father, and was faithful as a Son over his own House.

2. That which is not contained in his last Will and Testament in this and other matters, is sufficient to declare his Mind and Will in the Negative. And so you know ’tis in all last Wills and Testaments among Men, if it be not expressed in the Affirmative, it needs not be expressed in the Negative; and if not, because ’tis not forbidden it may be done, so may an hundred things more; nay many Jewish Rites, and Popish Innovations too, for where are they forbid? The Sum therefore of my Answer is this: The Privileges, which are Rites, Ordinances, or Sacraments, are not so many as you would have, or so many as the Jews of old had; nor are they to be administered according as they fancy or approve of, or according to their Reasonings, but according to God’s express Appointment. Rightly doth Mr. Ball in his ——— Book speak, *Posit. 3, 4. pag. 38.*

“ But in whatsoever Circumcision and Baptism do agree or
 “ differ, we must look to the Institution, and neither
 “ stretch it wider, nor draw it narrower than the Lord
 “ had made it: for he is the Instituter of the Sacraments
 “ according to his good Pleasure; and it is our part to
 “ learn of him, both to whom, how, and to what end the
 “ Sacraments are to be administered, how they agree and
 “ wherein they differ: In all which we must affirm nothing
 “ but what God hath taught us, and as he hath taught
 “ us.

Were it not thus, how could we deny or oppose the Papists seven Sacraments? or condemn Salt, Oil, Spittle to be used in Baptism, which they use in it, seeing these are not forbid? But well saith *Tertullian*, “ Is it lawful because
 “ ’tis not forbidden? ’tis therefore unlawful because ’tis not
 “ commanded.

’Tis further suggested by the Pedo-baptists by way of Objection, *viz.* That it lays a mighty Stumbling-block (I

mean the Baptist Principle) in the way of the Jews Conversion to Christianity: Will this, say they, encourage a Jew's Conversion to embrace the Religion of Jesus, to tell him of the high and glorious Privileges that he shall be interested in himself upon his believing on him, but for his Children they are cast out?

Ans. Did this stumble them in the Apostolical Days, who were told that *Circumcision availed nothing, nor Uncircumcision?* The truth is, if Circumcision availed nothing, but was a Yoke of Bondage, then why should that stumble them? It might be a greater Stumbling-block in their way, to tell them their Church-state, and all their Privileges are now gone, and now they must not look upon themselves better than the Gentiles; no more Scepter in Judah, no Land of Canaan, no Temple, no High-Priest, the Levites Sons, as such, now no more Ministers, no Succession of Priesthood: What of all this, when they hear of better Privileges for them? and that their Infants who die may go to Heaven, tho not circumcised, nor baptized? And if they live to be Men and Women, and do believe, (or God please to call them) the Promise of Pardon of Sin, and of the Holy Spirit is to them, and that they shall be saved *Act. 2. 39.* Are not they and all others told, that *old things are passed away, and all things are become new?* &c. *2 Cor. 5. 16.* *Wherefore henceforth we know no Man after the Flesh.* It seems then that heretofore there had been a knowledg of Persons after the Flesh, and 'tis plain there was, because the Jews were of the Natural or Fleshly Seed of Abraham, and were therefore all of them admitted to the Privilege of external Church-Membership, while others were exempted: But we see the Apostle resolves henceforth to disclaim any such *Value, Esteem, Preference, or Knowledg of them,* or any others upon the account of meer fleshly Descent: And to this very purpose immediately subjoins in the following Verse, *Therefore if any Man be in Christ, he is a new Creature: old things now are past away, and all things are become new:* the old Church and old Church-Membership, Privileges, Rites and Ordinances; and a new Church-state, new Ordinances, new Rites, a new Seed, and a new way of Introduction unto the Participation of Gospel-Privileges and Church-Membership; and if this should stumble them, who can help it? we know they have stumbled upon as bad a Rock as this.

Moreover, denying Infants any Right to Gospel-Ordinances, cannot fill the Mouths of Jewish Children with clamorous and passionate Complaints against Christianity, because they could not see Jewish Children had such benefit by Circumcision as you intimate: No, no, they must yield to the Sovereign Will of the great Lord, and plead for no more Privileges, nor any otherwise than he seems good to ordain and appoint.

I am sure if what you and other Pedo-baptists say was true, it is enough to fill the Mouths of poor Unbelievers Children among us who are Gentiles, with clamorous Complaints against their Parents, if they did regard what you say; and doubtless there are more of them, I mean, more Children born of Ungodly Parents, than such born of Godly Parents: And what may they say, and how may they expostulate their own Condition? Alas! alas! sad is our State, our Parents were wicked and ungodly People, and we are by that means left of God; to us belongs no Covenant, no Sacraments, nor hopes of Mercy; God hath taken none but the Children of godly Persons into Covenant! We are baptized, alas! but had no right to it; our Condition is as bad as the State of the Children of Pagans and Turks! Sir, if People did consider well the Purport of this Doctrine, they must needs have their Hearts rise against all the Broachers of it: Nay, all or most Children may be in doubt, whether their Parents were truly Godly, and so in Covenant or not; for if not, you must fly to some other Argument to prove their Baptism and Church-Privileges, than that of their Parents being in Covenant. True, the case under the Law was another thing; for if their Parents were Jews, or the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, whether Godly or not, yet they knew they had right to those external Privileges.

I have seen some Arguments fram'd by a Pedo-baptist, in order to the proving that the Covenant made with *Abraham*, was a Covenant of Grace; and he endeavours to prove the same, 1. From the Language and Expression of it. 2. From the Duration of it. 3. From the Blessings by it.

1. The Language and Expression of it, *Gen. 17.7. I will be a God unto thee, and to thy Seed after thee.* Now (say they) is not this a pure Gospel-Phrase, and shews it to be a Covenant with *Abraham* in Christ? I pray how comes the Almighty God (who, upon the breach of the Covenant of

Works made with us in *Adam*, became our enraged Enemy) to be a God unto fallen Man, any other ways than by a Mediator? &c.

Ans. 1. I have proved that there was a twofold Covenant made with *Abraham*, and I deny not but the Covenant of Grace made in Christ was promised to *Abraham*, which takes in only the true Spiritual Seed, and to all those God is in a special manner become a God unto.

2. Evident it is, all manner of God's covenanting Transactions since the Fall, of what nature soever, have been no other ways than through the Interposition of a Mediator, as that with *Noah* about the Flood, &c. *Gen.* 9. 8, 9. in that God shewed himself to be the God of the whole World, and so he is by Creation and Providence; yet it doth not follow that Covenant was the Covenant of Grace; or that God hath received them into special Favour with himself. So when God gave out that fiery Law on Mount *Sinai*, he told them, *Exod.* 20. 2. *I am the Lord your God*, &c. this was the very Introduction to that part of the Law which was written in Stone; but nevertheless the Apostle expressly calls it, a *Ministration of Death and Condemnation*, *2 Cor.* 3. 7, 8. and that it killed and could not give Life. Now must this be a Covenant of Faith or Grace? How is it then that the Apostle *Paul* says, the Law is not of Faith; also the Covenant of Grace giveth Life? But I argue thus, The Law could not give Life; *Ergo*, The Law was not a Covenant of Grace. So much for the first Note or Observation.

2. The second Observation is, The Duration or Continuance of this Covenant made with *Abraham*, the Lord calls it an *Everlasting Covenant*, &c.

Ans. This might have been left out, only it adds to the Number: this is answered by the Objector himself (be he who he will) in saying the Hebrew word for *Everlasting*, sometimes signifies no more than a long Continuance of Time: We know it very well; and those Mosaical Rites that ended in Christ, are said to be for everlasting. But when the Lord saith he will be a Person's God for ever and ever, or everlastingly, it denotes his being so to all Eternity: But God never said he would be the God everlastingly, or to all Eternity, to all who were concern'd in the Covenant of Circumcision; nor was he *Ishmael's* God so, tho circumcised; and has he not cast off that whole Nation of the Jews,

Jews, with whom he made that Covenant? and is not so their God now, tho he is, I confess, to all Eternity, or everlastingly, the God of all *Abraham's* Spiritual Seed; viz. all true Believers in Christ.

3. The third and last Argument or Note to prove the Covenant of Circumcision a Covenant of Grace, is taken from the Benefits and Blessings conveyed by it. *To be a God unto him, and to his Seed, and that everlastingly*, is a most comprehensive Gospel-Blessing; for hereby (say they) God gives a Person an Interest in all that he is, and in all that he has, so far as can be communicated to a Creature. This Blessing promised to *Abraham* comprehends Christ, Grace, Holiness here, and Glory and Happiness hereafter. And accordingly we find the Apostle, *Heb. 8.* uses the same Expression with this of God's to *Abraham*, *I will be to them a God, and they shall be to me a People.*

Ans. This is *idem*, & *his idem culpandum est*, the same again which is already answered. Is God everlastingly a God to *Abraham* and to all his Fleshly Seed, and to Believers, who are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, and to all their Fleshly Seed; I say, is this so? Does God give himself, all he is, and all he has, to every Believer, and to all his Fleshly Seed? Have all their Children, or every one of them, Christ, Grace, Holiness here, and Glory and eternal Happiness hereafter? Or, are they not to be justly blamed who jumble things so confusedly together? 'Tis true, the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, and all his true Spiritual Seed (who are the Elect) have Interest in all God is, and has, so far as it can be communicated to Creatures; and we know they have Christ (as well as are Christ's, as *Paul* notes, *Gal. 4.*) and Grace here, and shall have Glory hereafter. But a multitude of *Abraham's* Natural Off-spring, and the Natural Off-spring of Believers has neither Christ nor Grace, nor shall be saved, but perish eternally. Therefore this may serve for an Answer, with what I have proved before, touching the nature of that twofold Covenant made with *Abraham*.

Let us come to what is further asserted:

If the Covenant which God made with *Abraham* be one and the same with the Covenant of Grace, then our Infant-Seed have right to Baptism.

Ans. This has been urged before, and I have already answered it, only I shall add a Passage or two of *Martin Luther's*.

“ *Paul*

“ *Paul* therefore concludeth with this Sentence (saith he)
 “ They which are of Faith, are the Children of *Abraham*:
 “ That Corporal Birth, or Carnal Seed makes not the Chil-
 “ dren of *Abraham* before God. As if he would say, there
 “ is none before God accounted as the Child of this *Abra-*
 “ *ham* (who is the Servant of God, whom God hath
 “ chosen and made righteous by Faith) through Carnal
 “ Generation, but such Children must be given before
 “ God as he was a Father, but he was a Father of Faith,
 “ was justified and pleased God; not because he could be-
 “ get Children after the Flesh, not because he had Cir-
 “ cumcision under the Law, but because he believed in
 “ God. He therefore that will be a Child of the believing
 “ *Abraham*, must also himself believe, or else he is not a
 “ Child of the Elect, the believing and the justified *Abra-*
 “ *ham*, but only the begetting *Abraham*, which is nothing
 “ else but a Man, conceived, born and wrapt in Sin, with-
 “ out the Forgiveness of Sin, without Faith, without the
 “ Holy Ghost, as another Man is, and therefore condemned:
 “ such also are the Children carnally begotten of him,
 “ having nothing in them like unto their Father, but Flesh
 “ and Blood, Sin and Death; therefore these are all
 “ damned. This glorious boasting then we are the Seed of
 “ *Abraham*, is to no purpose. Thus far, and much more
 to the same purpose he excellently debates upon.

Mr. *Perkins* on the *Galatians*, concerning the Covenant
 made with *Abraham*: “ The Seed of *Abraham* (saith he) is
 “ the Seed not of the Flesh, but of the Promise: And
 “ this Seed is first Christ, and then all that believe in
 “ Christ; for all these are given to *Abraham* by Promise
 “ and Election of God. Moreover, this Seed is not many,
 “ (as *Paul* observeth) but one. It is objected, that the
 “ word *Seed* is a Name collective, and signifies the whole
 “ Posterity of *Abraham*. *Ans.* It doth sometimes (saith
 “ he) but not always; for *Eve* saith of *Seth*, *God hath*
 “ *given me another Seed*. Again (he saith) this one particu-
 “ lar Seed of *Abraham*, is Christ Jesus, here call’d by the
 “ Name Christ, first and principally the Mediator; and
 “ then, secondarily, all Jews and Gentiles believing that are
 “ fit and grafted into Christ by Faith. *St. Paul* saith, the
 “ Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of
 “ God; but the Children of the Promise are the Seed of
 “ *Abraham*, Rom. 9. 8.

Now

Now this Covenant we grant thus made with *Abraham*, is one and the same with the Covenant of Grace; but what does this signify to the Infants, or Fleſhly Seed of Believers, as ſuch? And thus I ſhall paſs to your next Argument.

“ You ſay, the Children of the Faithful are in God’s Covenant, becauſe Chriſt is the Mediator of a better Covenant, which was eſtabliſhed upon better Promiſes, *Heb. 8. 6, &c.* But, ſay you, if the Children of the Faithful are excluded from the Covenant, then the Covenant is worſe, and not a better Covenant? It was a great Privilege of Children being in Covenant, *Rom. 9. 4.* for the Promiſes of God belonged to them; but if the Covenant be ſhortened in Privileges, how is it a better Covenant? &c.

Anſw. 1. I anſwer; It is granted by us that the Children of the Jews, whether they were believing Jews, or unbelieving Jews, godly Perſons or ungodly Perſons, they were in that external Covenant God made with *Abraham’s* Natural Seed, as ſuch, or with the whole Houſe of *Israel* under the Old Teſtament, or old Covenant: But the Promiſes and that Covenant then ran not to the Seed of believing Jews only, but if they were *Abraham’s* Seed, I mean his Natural Seed, whether Believers or Unbelievers. Circumciſion belonged to the Male-Infants, as ſuch, and all other external Privileges, but the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* ran only then as it runs now, *viz.* to all the Elect only, not to their Carnal Seed, as ſuch, but to their Spiritual Seed. If you are a Believer, you are in the Covenant of Grace; and if your Child in Infancy be one of God’s Elect, that decretively is in the ſame Covenant of Grace, but not actually until it doth believe, and has actual Union with Chriſt by Faith, and partakes of the holy Spirit, which is the Bond of that Union, and Seal of the Covenant of Grace. No external Rite can be the Seal of the Spiritual Covenant. If therefore Circumciſion was a Seal of any Covenant, it was the External and Legal Covenant: tho *Abraham*, ’tis true, received it as the Seal of the Righteouſneſs of his Faith, even of that Faith he had being uncircumciſed; and in that ſenſe it could be a Seal to no other Perſon but to *Abraham* only: for who beſides him had the Righteouſneſs of Faith before they were circumciſed, and that they ſhould be Fathers to all
that

that believed, not only of believing Jews, but believing Gentiles also? for so ran the Covenant of the Righteousness of Faith God made with *Abraham*. And has God made such a Covenant with you, or with any Believer now? Or, is there any such Covenant-Head under the Gospel, save Jesus Christ alone? *Abraham* was but a Typical Father; the Covenant made with him and his Natural Seed, as such, typified Christ, and all his Spiritual Seed.

2. We have proved in the Legal or Old Covenant, there were many other external Privileges besides Circumcision, and external visible Church-Membership, several of which we have mentioned; to which we may add, they had a right to the Land of *Canaan*, and to a Civil Government and Governours among themselves, or a Political Commonwealth, as also a right to a glorious external Temple. But, Sir, is the Gospel-Covenant worse than that Legal Covenant, because we and our Children have not such Promises and external Privileges? Certainly if God pleases to open your Eyes, you will soon see and confess your Mistake. Besides, the Apostle calling it a better Covenant, and better Promises, clearly shews they are not external Privileges, but spiritual: and so in that sense I have proved the Privileges and Promises of the Covenant of Grace, do far exceed the Privileges the Jews had then; and our Childrens Privileges are greater also, tho not to be received as Members into the Gospel-Church till they do believe.

“ You say, the Covenant of Grace that God made with
 “ *Abraham* was an immutable Covenant, it was confirmed
 “ by an Oath, *Heb. 6. 13, 17, &c.* therefore if the Chil-
 “ dren are excluded the Covenant (you say) it is mutable;
 “ and if so, what is become of the Oath and the Promises
 “ of God? Where is the strong Consolation? Where is
 “ the Immutability of God’s Counsel? Therefore (say
 “ you) those that do cast out the Children of the Faith-
 “ ful from the Covenant of Grace, &c. weaken their Con-
 “ solation, and nullify the eternal Covenant, and make
 “ God a Liar, 1 *John 5. 10.*

Ans. 1. I answer; Here you charge us home, and lay horrid Evil at our Doors, that do deny the Children of Believers, as such, to be in the Covenant of Grace: but how unjustly and unrighteously we are charged by you, I shall, God assisting, make appear.

2. Sir,

2. Sir, Are all Believers Children in the Covenant of Grace? I affirm, and will stand by it, if so, they shall all be saved, because all and every Soul that was, or is in the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*, shall be saved, because it is an immutable Covenant, and God's Promise and Oath are passed to secure them of Eternal Life. Sir, the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, as such, never had any ground of strong Consolation; God never made a Promise, and bound it with an Oath, that they should all be saved; I speak of *Abraham's* Fleishly Seed, as so considered, or as such; for if he had made such an immutable Covenant with them, and confirm'd it by his Oath, What is become of his Promises and Oath, since he hath cast off *Abraham's* Natural Seed? O how preposterously you argue! See *Rom. 9. 6.* *Not as tho the Word of God hath taken none Effect: For they are not all Israel which are of Israel: Neither because they are the Seed of Abraham are they all Children; but in Isaac shall thy Seed be called, i. e. They that are the Children of the Flesh, i. e. as such, these are not the Children of God; but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed.* Sir, this Text says as much as we do affirm. The Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, viz. all the Elect of God, or Believers only, are in the immutable Covenant, and have strong Consolation; but who can tell or know who they are that are God's Elect Ones until they believe, or are under effectual Vocation? and that Election runs only to Believers Seed, as such, you will not say: For many Children of Unbelievers we see daily are in God's eternal Election by their special Vocation, and many Children of Believers are not elected, because never called..

2. Were it the immutable Counsel of God, that all Believers Children should be called, adopted, justified and eternally saved, you had said something, and then all their Natural Seed might have strong Consolation indeed. But alas, alas, how many Godly Mens Children prove wicked and ungodly, and so live and die! Were these such, think you, that ever were in the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*? Had they ever any ground of strong Consolation?

3. Come, Sir, the Odium falls on your self. I argue thus: If all the Children of Believers are in the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*, and yet many of them eternally perish, what then is become of the immutable

table and everlasting Covenant of Grace? nay of the Promises and Oath of God? and also of the Doctrine of final Perseverance? O what Shame do you *Pedo-baptists* bring upon your selves, by arguing after this blind manner for your *Babes Baptism*!

4. But perhaps you will say, you argue for the external Privileges of the Covenant of Grace to belong to your Children, as such, and not the spiritual and special Blessings of it.

Ans. If so, the case is still worse: for then it will follow, that God in the Covenant of Grace hath by his Promise and Oath, and Immutability of his Counsel, given to all Persons ground of strong Consolation, that only have a share in the outward Rites and external Parts of the Covenant of Grace.

Sir, deliver your self as well as you can from being ground to pieces between these two Mill-stones.

But why must your Children only have but part of the external Privileges of the Covenant of Grace, who only partake of Baptism, and not of the Lord's-Supper? Is not Faith required of all such that ought to be baptized, as well as it is required in all that partake of the Lord's Supper to examine themselves? neither of which Infants are capable to do.

It is manifest that the Children of the Faithful, as such, are not in the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*; but that there was a twofold Covenant made with him, and that the Covenant of Grace only appertains to the Elect of God, whether they be Children of Believers or Children of Unbelievers, which is not known to us until they are grown up, and are brought by the Spirit of God under special Vocation and Regeneration; and that they are the Adult only, *viz.* such as believe, that have right to Baptism, but that not by virtue of the Covenant of Grace, but by virtue of the positive Command of Christ in the New Testament. Sir, you mistake again, it was not by virtue of the Covenant of Grace, that Persons had right to Circumcision; for if so, then *Lot*, and *Melchisedec*, and *Abraham's* Males as soon as they were born had a right to it, as also his Females; nothing gave right to *Abraham's* Male-Infants to Circumcision but the meer positive Command of God to him, which extended only to those Males in his own House, or bought with his Money, and not till the

the eighth day : for such that died before the eighth day, tho Males, had no right to be circumcised, nor had his Females any right thereto ; so none but Believers, when they can give an account of their Faith, by virtue of Christ's exprefs and positive Command, ought to be baptized. Pray remember the Covenant of Grace, as such, gives no right to Baptism ; for if it did, all Believers or Elect Persons had right to it from the first Introduction or Declaration of it to *Adam* upon the Fall. No, no, it is a pure Gospel-Ordinance, and meerly positive, and only depends upon the Will and Pleasure of the Law-giver, *Jesus Christ*.

Honoured *Britains*, who inhabit North and South *Wales*, let me intreat you to consider how false the Conclusion is that *Mr. Owen* draws, concerning the Right the Infants of the Faithful have to Baptism ; namely, that if they are in the Covenant of Grace, then they ought to be baptized : For as he, nor no Man else can prove, the Infants of Believers, as such, are in the Covenant of Grace ; so it would not follow, were that granted, that they ought to be baptized, it being not the Covenant of Grace, but the exprefs and positive Command of Christ that gives Persons just Right thereunto. Suppose Christ had not commanded Believers to be baptized, would any Man have adventured to baptize them, or conclude it was their Duty because they were in Covenant with God ? Or would *Abraham* have been circumcised himself, because in the Covenant of Grace, had he not received a positive Command so to be ? Certainly he was long in the Covenant of Grace before he was circumcised, and did not sin thereby, because God had not given that Precept to him until he was old.

Moreover, it was the exprefs Command of God that gave right to his Male-Infants to be circumcised, and not only those of his Seed that were in the Covenant of Grace, but *Ishmael*, and others who were not Children of the Promise, or in the Covenant of Grace, were circumcised, and alio it was not *Lot's* Duty, tho in the Covenant of Grace, to be circumcised, because not one that dwelt in *Abraham's* Family, or his Natural Seed, nor commanded by the Lord to be circumcised, or to circumcise his Infants.

C H A P. VII.

Proving Infant-Baptism is not lawful, because Circumcision under the Law belonged unto the Male-Infants of the Jews, containing an Answer to Mr. James Owen's first Chapter.

IF, say you, Circumcision under the Law belonged unto Infants, then Baptism under the Gospel belongeth unto them; for even as Circumcision was, so Baptism is the Seal of the same Covenant of Grace, and signifieth the same things.

Ans. 1. I answer; If Circumcision did not belong to Infants under the Law, any otherwise than by exprefs and positive Command of God, which gave them right thereto; then if God hath not commanded Believers to baptize their Infants, it is not their Duty to baptize them, but their Sin if they do it. But I have proved it was the exprefs Command of God only that gave Male-Infants proceeding from *Abraham's* Loins Authority to be circumcised; and God hath given no such Command to Believers to baptize their Infants; therefore Baptism doth not belong to the Infants of Believers, as such, under the Gospel, as Circumcision did belong to Male-Infants under the Law.

2. I have proved Circumcision was not the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, tho it was a Seal to *Abraham* of the Righteousness of his own Faith, yea of that Faith he had being not circumcised. A Seal I have shewed gives an undoubted Right of all those Blessings and Privileges to those Persons to whom the said Covenant is sealed, and so it did to *Abraham*: but it was no Seal of the Blessings of the Covenant of Grace to *Ishmael*, *Esaú*, and many thousands more who were commanded to be circumcised. Were this therefore true that *Mr. Owen* asserts, That Circumcision was a Seal of the Covenant of Grace to all that were circumcised in Infancy, then they were all saved, even all the Males* that proceeded from *Abraham's* Loins, many of which proved as vile and wicked Men as most that ever lived in the

the World. Nor, Reader, is Baptism a Seal of the Covenant of Grace under the Gospel; for if so, it would seal all Gospel-Blessings to all Persons that are baptized: who then (were it so) but would be baptized, and baptize his Children? Brethren, the holy Spirit only is the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, or Gospel-Covenant, *vid. Ephes. 1:13, 14. cap. 4. 10.*

You proceed, to shew in several respects, that Circumcision and Baptism signify the same things.

1. "You say, because Original Corruption cometh by Natural Generation.

2. "Because we are born in Uncleanness, we must be washed in our Infancy.

Ans. 1. Supposing that Circumcision did, and Baptism doth signify the Corruption or Filthiness of Original Sin, or Uncleanness; must we therefore baptize our Infants without any Authority, Command or Example in God's Word?

2. Doth Baptism wash away Original Corruption? I know the Papists assert it doth do this, but how do they or you prove it? Baptism, *St. Peter* saith, doth not wash away the Filthiness of the Flesh, or Corruption of Natural Pollution, *1 Pet. 3. 21.*

3. Your Reverend Brother Mr. *Stephen Charnock* fully proves that Baptism is not Regeneration, that can't cleanse from Sin. Answer his Arguments in his Book of Regeneration. What tho those Baptists in *Germany* you speak of, understood that the antient erring Fathers that introduced Infant-Baptism, did bring it in to wash away Original Sin; Cannot Christ cleanse Elect dying Infants from Original Sin by virtue of his Blood, in a way unknown unto us? Must we deny Original Sin, or own Infant-Baptism does cleanse from it? Strange Divinity! you prove nothing.

4. "You say, all were not regenerated in Circumcision, but God blessed his own Ordinance in his own time, for the Regeneration of his Elect, &c. So say you, not that all are regenerated in Baptism, but because Baptism sheweth the necessity of Regeneration, and being effectual in time unto all those that are elected, for working Regeneration in them.

Ans. 1. You say, all were not regenerated in Circumcision, and so, not that all are, say you, regenerated in Baptism, &c.

Sir, take heed you do not deceive the Souls of People. I deny that ever any one Soul was regenerated in Infancy, either in Circumcision or Baptism; nor did God ever ordain either of those external Ordinances to regenerate young or old.

2. I know the Scripture, and worthy Divines hold forth that Baptism is a *Sign* of present Regeneration; they that ought to be baptized, *i. e.* Believers, do rise out of the watery Grave, as Dr. *Sherlock* asserts; new born Creatures; but thus do not Infants whom you baptize, or rather rantize.

3. Prove, if you can, that God ever blessed Circumcision or Baptism to the Regeneration of any Elect Infants when grown up: But if none but Elect Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, why do you baptize, as you call it, all the Infants of Believers? Are all their Children elected, and none but theirs? Are not many Children of Unbelievers elected? Why then are such not to be baptized, as well as the Children of the Faithful?

Sir, we know not who are elected till called, and Baptism belongs to none but such who can make a Profession of their Faith, and give Evidence of effectual Calling, and present Regeneration. You write but your own Phantasie, not God's unerring and certain Truth.

4. "You say, *Abraham's* Heart was circumcised, before
"the Flesh of his Fore-skin; but you intimate his Childrens
"Flesh was circumcised before their Hearts were
"circumcised. In the same manner, you say, our Ancestors
"the Gentiles, were first Fruits unto Christ, and
"were regenerated before baptized; but their Seed are
"baptized before they are regenerated. To *Abraham*, you
"say, it was a Seal of the Covenant of Grace he had, and
"of the Righteousness of his Faith before circumcised;
"but to his Seed it was a Sign of the Righteousness of
"Faith they were bound to receive for Justification,
"after they were circumcised: and so you speak of Believers
"Seed in respect of Baptism.

Ans. 1. I answer; *Abraham* only received Circumcision as a Seal of the Righteousness of his Faith, &c. But prove that Circumcision did bind all his Children to receive by Faith Justification: 'tis a bold Assertion. I have proved, that Circumcision did not appertain to the Covenant of Grace, but to the external or fleshly Covenant God made with

with *Abraham*, and in him with the whole Nation of the Jews: and therefore 'tis positively affirmed by the Apostle; That such that were circumcised were bound to keep the whole Law, *Gal. 3. 3.* not to receive by Faith Justification. Your Parallel between Circumcision and Baptism ('tis true) well futes with the Human Contrivance of those that first invented Infant-Baptism, who would thereby fain make the Gospel-Church National, as the Jewish Church was, and confirm the old Church-Right and Church-Membership, which is taken away, and a new Church-state erected, which doth not consist of Believers, and their Carnal Seed, as such, but only of the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, who are Believers or living Stones, who are built up a Spiritual House, *1 Pet. 2. 5, 6.* The Gospel-Church is not National but Congregational, say what you please to the contrary.

2. Therefore as the Faithful at first among the Gentiles and Jews too, received Baptism as Believers, being regenerated before baptized, so must we unless you have a new Gospel, or fresh Authority to change the Administration of Gospel-Ordinances, and the Gospel-Church. I thought the Water as it just came forth of the Fountain was most pure, you do but plead for the muddy Water that has run through the Popish Stream.

" You say, Circumcision was a Sign of Admission into the Church of God, every Male did come in through that Door; the uncircumcised had no right to the Privileges of the visible Church. So you would have Baptism to run.

Ans. 1. 'Tis not true what you say, Circumcision was not the Door into the Jewish Church, they were all born Members of that National Church, and therefore their Females were as truly Members (that were not required to be circumcised) as their Males.

2. Tho we grant Baptism is the initiating Ordinance into the Gospel-Church, yet it admits of no Members but Believers only; if any others upon a false Faith get into it, they have no just Right thereto, and, when discovered, are to be put out.

3. Sir, tremble at the Thoughts of what you say! It is not we, but Christ in his Blessed Gospel, that excludes Infants, or the Natural Seed of Believers, as such, from being Members of the Gospel-Church; he hath shut up that Door, viz. by Generation, i. e. being the Seed of *Abraham*, or Seed of Believers, as such, and hath opened the Door

of Regeneration: 'Tis we that believe, and our Children that the Lord our God shall call, and none else.

4. Sir, Circumcision was so far from being any such a Privilege as you intimate, that the Apostle calls it such a Yoke of Bondage, that neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear, *Act. 15*. And in Answer to what you say, *p*. It was not for their Sin, nor the Sin of their Parents that Infants are excluded, or not received into the Gospel-Church, but because it was the good Pleasure of God to erect another, and more spiritual Church-state, and to remove the old Way, and Typical Church-state of *Israel*.

5. Therefore for you to intimate as if we were so unnatural, as to cast our Children out of God's House, is not to be indured; it doth but reflect on the Wisdom of God: we are more faithful to our Children (and not like the *Ostritch*) than you, for we would not allow them that Right which God hath not; nor make them think in Baptism they were regenerated and made Members of God's Church, and so deceive, and put them upon a Temptation not to seek out for any other Regeneration, and Gospel-Right to Church-Membership.

" You say, Circumcision was an Obligation to put off
" the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, and, say you, Bap-
" tism putteth us under the same Obligation, *&c.*

Ans^r. Baptism can oblige none to put off the Body of Sin, but such that are the true Subjects of it, by virtue of Christ's holy Institution, which are only Believers, such who before baptized have received the Spirit of God so to do: But you, without any Warrant from Christ, would put this hard Obligation on your poor Infants, whereas you know not whether ever God will give them his Spirit or Grace, to enable them so to do: And as one Pseudo-baptist lately saith, If they do not discharge this Obligation, *viz.* their Baptismal Covenant, they are guilty of Perjury, and 'tis the damning Sin.

O cruel Parents! you list your Infants into the Spiritual War by your pretended Baptism, and arm them not. The Graces of the Spirit are the Believers Spiritual Armour and Weapons, these they have when listed, I mean baptized; but Infants, as such, have not this Armour on when baptized: Alas! poor Babes they have too much Guilt upon them naturally! O the Weight that lies upon them! but
you

you *Pedo-baptists* add to it by your Tradition of a Baptismal Covenant, that God never appointed them to come under.

Therefore you object, "How can Children be bound to that which they are ignorant of? You answer, They were ignorant of the Bond of Circumcision, and yet were bound over to the Law to take him to be their God, and to depart from the ways of Sin, &c.

Ans. Because God obliged and bound over the Jews by Circumcision in their Infancy in that Legal Covenant, to love the Lord their God with all their Hearts, to take him to be their God, and to depart from all the ways of Sin, nay to keep the Law perfectly, (which shewed the necessity of Christ's Righteousness and Merits) which was nevertheless upon this respect a Yoke of Bondage, which Yoke by Christ we and our Children are delivered from: Will you adventure to bring your poor Children under another like Yoke of Bondage? *Christ's Yoke is easy, and his Burden is light*, because he gives all that are to be baptized his Spirit, and a changed Heart to love God, and cleave to him, and serve him; but you make his Yoke as hard as the Yoke of Circumcision, by putting Baptism on your poor Infants, to oblige them thereby to be regenerated and love God with all their Hearts, before Grace in the Habit of it is infused into them, and all this without the least Authority from Christ or the Gospel. O cruel Parents! Sirs, who hath required this at your Hands? You shall hear more of this hereafter.

"You do intimate, that 'tis true Circumcision did oblige to keep the Law perfectly since the Law, but from the beginning it was not so; for, say you, Circumcision was not of *Moses*, but of the Fathers, *Joh. 7. 22*.

Ans. Was not the Moral Law from the beginning? and were not those that were circumcised bound to keep the Moral as well as the Ceremonial Law? How then dare you say, and prove it not, that from the beginning it was not so, *i. e.* It did not bind *Abraham's* Natural Seed exactly to keep the Moral Law, that is, to love God with all their Hearts, and their Neighbours as themselves, yea to leave and loath all Sin?

Circumcision I have proved was no Seal nor part of the Covenant of Grace, but of, and part of the Covenant of Works; so that you run into a dangerous Snare, and de-

ceive the People unwarily by your Ignorance of the two Covenants made with *Abraham*, and not distinguishing Circumcision from being a Seal to *Abraham's* Faith, and not a Seal in common to all his Children. It was a Sign to them in their Flesh, but no Seal of the Covenant of Grace. You further run a Parallel between Circumcision and Baptism, as some others before you have done: Pray take my former Answers to all you say here which I have given to other Pedit-baptists upon this foot of account.

1. Others formerly have (as well as you do now) affirmed, That Baptism comes in the room of Circumcision.

2. They run a Parallel between Circumcision and Baptism, and would have them both signify the same thing in an exact Analogy. *Q. Which I answer:*

Say they, which you seem to affirm also, If Baptism succeeds in the room of Circumcision, then as the Jewish Infants were circumcised, so the Infants of Christians may and ought to be baptized: But Baptism succeeds in the room of Circumcision: Therefore as their Children were circumcised then, so may ours be baptized now.

Ans. 1. There is no necessity that a Gospel-Ordinance must succeed in the room of a Legal or Jewish Ordinance. What if I affirm, that no Ordinance succeeds in the room of Circumcision? Were there not many other Rites and Ordinances under the Law, or Old Testament, besides Circumcision? and yet you cannot find, or once imagine any Gospel-Rite or Ordinance to come in the room of them respectively, for that then it would follow, there would be as many Christian Rites, Precepts and Ordinances, as there were Jewish Rites, Precepts and Ordinances, which, as one observes, were more than three hundred.

2. Besides, as *Dr. Taylor* observes, "If Baptism came in the room of Circumcision, you must baptize your Children always on the eighth day, and you must not baptize your Females at all, because none but Male Infants were then circumcised."

3 And whereas you say that Baptism signifies the same things that Circumcision did, it is not true, as will appear to all understanding Men, if they consider these Particulars following, which are so many Disparities, *viz.*

(1.) Circumcision was a Shadow of Christ to come; Baptism is a Sign he is already come, was dead and buried.

(2) Cir-

(2.) Circumcision was a Sign of the Covenant made with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed ; Baptism is a Sign of the peculiar spiritual Privileges made to Saints, as such, and no others.

(3.) Circumcision was a Domestick Action, *i. e.* to be done in the House ; Baptism an Ecclesiastick, belonging to the Gospel-Church.

(4.) Circumcision was to be done by the Parents in that respect ; Baptism is to be done only by Gospel-Ministers.

(5.) Circumcision was the cutting off the Foreskin of the Flesh, which drew Blood ; Baptism is to be done by dipping the whole Body into the Water, without drawing of any Blood.

(6.) Circumcision belonged to Male-Children only ; Baptism belongs to Males and Females also.

(7.) Circumcision was to be done precisely on the eighth Day ; Baptism is not limited to any precise Day.

(8.) Circumcision made a visible Impression on the Body, which the Party might perceive when he came to Age of Understanding ; Baptism leaves no Impression on the Body.

(9.) Circumcision belonged to *Abraham's* House, to his Male-Infants only, or such who were bought with his Money, and not the Male-Infants of any other Godly Men in his days, unless they join themselves to his Family ; Baptism belongs to Believers in all Nations.

(10.) Circumcision bound those who came under that Rite to keep the whole Law of *Moses* ; Baptism signifies we are delivered from that Yoke of Bondage.

(11.) If Circumcision signified the same things, and consequently, particularly the sealing the Covenant of Grace, then those that were circumcised needed not to be baptized, because sealed before with the same Seal, or that which signified the same thing ; but Christ and all his Apostles, and many others, who were circumcised, were nevertheless baptized.

(12.) Circumcision signified the taking away the Sins of the Flesh, or the Circumcision of the Heart ; but Baptism signifies the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, which Circumcision did not.

(13.) Circumcision was to be a Partition-Wall betwixt Jew and Gentile ; but Baptism testifieth that Jew and Gen-

tile, Male and Female, Barbarian and Seythian, Bond and Free, are all one in Christ Jesus.

Therefore there are divers Disparities and different Significations between Circumcision and Baptism.

4. And what tho we should grant that Circumcision was then the initiating Ordinance, and Baptism is so now in Gospel-Times, i. e. an Ordinance of Initiation; yet Circumcision initiated none into the Jewish Church, but such who were by exprefs and positive Command of God to be circumcised, who were only Male-Infants (for the Females were initiated without it); even so Baptism, tho it be an initiating Ordinance, yet none are to be initiated thereby, but only those who by the exprefs Command are required to be baptized, and they are only such who believe, or make Profession of their Faith. Sir, Precepts that are meerly positive, greatly differ (you know well enough) from Precepts that are purely Moral in their own nature. Laws that are of meer positive Right, wholly depend upon the absolute Will and Pleasure of the great *Legislator*; and in all Cases and Circumstances we must keep to the exprefs words of the Institution, we must venture to do no more, nor less, nor do any thing in any other manner than God hath commanded, as appears in *Nadab* and *Abihu* and *Uzzab's* Cases; the first for offering of strange Fire, which thing God commanded them not (tho God in exprefs words no where forbid them so to do) were cut off, *Levit. 10. 1, 2.*

When God commanded *Abraham* to circumcise on the eighth day, did he not virtually forbid him to do it on the seventh or ninth day? Therefore this sort of reasoning of yours is meerly sophistical, and you do but *darken Counsel with Words without Knowl-dg.* Again, 'tis affirmed by you and other Peditors, That God hath no where declared that Infants should be excluded; you mean, he hath no where forbid in exprefs words the baptizing of Infants: No more, say I, has he forbid Honey, Wine, Oil, Salt, and Spittle to be used in Baptism; the former was used by some of the *Antient Fathers*, and the latter is still in the Romish Church: Where are we forbid to baptize Bells, and consecrate Water, as the Papists do to make it holy Water? Also where are Infants excluded from the Lord's-Table? If therefore any thing may be done in God's Worship which you suppose is not forbid, and bears also some proportion in Signification with Jewish Rites, all Popish Rites and

and Ceremonies may be let in at the same Door : For the Pope, Miter, Popish Vestures, Candle and Candlesticks, &c. they no doubt will tell you are of like Signification with the High-Priest under the Law, with the Priest's Vestures, and other Ceremonies among the Jews. Whither will this lead you ? 'tis dangerous to be led by such a Guide.

But to proceed, we will come to that grand Proof for Infant-Baptism you mention, *i. e.* That Baptism doth come in the room of Circumcision, which is in *Col. 2. 11, 12.* *In whom also ye are circumcised with the Circumcision made without Hands, by the Circumcision of Christ ; buried with him in Baptism, &c.* It is affirmed, " That the Design of the Apostle here is to take the *Colossians* off from the old Sacrament of Circumcision : He informs them that there was no Reason why they should be fond of it, because they were compleat without it, Christ having substituted a new Circumcision in the room of it, namely, Baptism ; and accordingly Christians may now be said, by Baptism, to be spiritually circumcised, as the Jews were said to be spiritually baptized.

Ans. This Exposition of this Text there is no ground to admit of; the Apostle speaks of the Power or Virtue of Christ's Circumcision : His Design is to shew we are compleat in Christ, and have him on ; he mentions Faith as well as Baptism, or such a Faith that should always attend Baptism ; and therefore Infant-Baptism from hence cannot be proved, or inferred, nor the least ground for such a bold Conclusion from hence, *viz.* That Baptism came in the room of Circumcision.

1. For first, the Apostle 'tis true excludes Circumcision, but 'tis upon another account, *viz.* by shewing Circumcision was a Figure of the Circumcision of the Heart, as *Rom. 2. 28, 29. Phil. 3. 3.* and since they had the same signified thereby, the Rite or Sign ceased. And as I have formerly replied in Answer to this Text, so I must say to you, all that can well be asserted from this Scripture, where the Apostle brings in Baptism, is no more than this, *viz.* That where Baptism is rightly administered, upon a proper Subject, it represents the Spiritual and Mystical Circumcision of the Heart, *i. e.* That the Soul is dead to Sin, or hath put off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ ; which may refer to the Power of his Death in the blessed Effects thereof, by the effectual Sin-killing Operations of the Spirit on the Heart. And as being dead to

S n,

Sin, we are buried with Christ in Baptism, both in Sign and Token of Christ's Burial, *i. e.* covered all over in the Water, which is a clear Symbol of his Burial; also in Signification, *i. e.* that we being dead, and buried with Christ in Baptism, so are to rise with him by the Faith of the Operation of God; and both these are held forth in true Baptism. The Apostle doth not mention Baptism to come in the room of Circumcision, but to shew that these believing *Colossians* had through Christ by the Spirit obtained the Antitype thereof, or thing figured out in the Circumcision of the Flesh, which Baptism did clearly represent. But since this is so strenuously urged afresh, tho so often answered, I will be at the trouble to transcribe once more what Dr. *Taylor*, late Bishop of *Down*, hath said to this Argument of yours, and others before you, about Circumcision, *viz.* That Baptism is the Antitype of it, or that it came in the room thereof.

" The Argument (saith he) from Circumcision is invalid
 " upon infinite Considerations: Figures and Types prove
 " nothing, unless a Command go along with them, or some
 " thing expresse to signify such to be their Purpose; for the
 " Deluge of Waters and Ark of *Noah* were Figures of Bap-
 " tism, saith *Peter*. If therefore the Circumstances of the
 " one be drawn to the other, we shall make Baptism a
 " Prodigy rather than a Rite. The Paschal Lamb was a
 " Figure of the Eucharist, which succeeds the other, as
 " Baptism doth Circumcision: But because there was in
 " the Manducation of the Paschal Lamb no Prescription of
 " Sacramental Drink, shall we conclude from hence the
 " Eucharist is to be administred in one kind? To which
 " let me add, Because Children, Servants, and all in the
 " House might eat of the Passover, must our Children
 " and all in our House eat of the Eucharist, or Supper of the
 " Lord? But saith the Doctor, In this very Instance of this
 " Argument; suppose a Correspondency of the Analogy
 " between Circumcision and Baptism, yet there is no Cor-
 " respondency of Identity; for tho it be granted both of
 " them did consign the Covenant of Faith, yet there is
 " nothing in the Circumstances of Children being circum-
 " cised, that so concerns that Mystery, but that it might
 " well be given to Men of Reason, because Circumcision
 " left a Character in the Flesh, which being imprinted up-
 " on the Infants, did its Work to them when they came to
 " Age;

" Age; and such a Character was necessary, because there
 " was no word added to the Sign. But Baptism imprints
 " nothing that remains on the Body; and if it leaves any
 " Character at all, it is upon the Soul, to which the word is
 " added, which is as much a part of the Sacrament as
 " the Sign it self; for both which Reasons it is requisite
 " that the Party baptized should be capable of Reason,
 " that he may be capable both of the Word and of the
 " Sacrament, and the Impress upon the Spirit. Since
 " therefore the Reason of the Parity does wholly fail,
 " there is nothing left to infer a necessity of complying
 " in the Circumstance of Age any more than in the other
 " Annexes of Types. The Infant must also precisely be
 " baptized upon the eighth day, and Females must not be
 " baptized at all, because not circumcised. But it were
 " more proper, if we would understand it aright, to pro-
 " secute the Analogy from the Type to the Antitype, by
 " the way of Letter and Spirit, and Signification; and as
 " Circumcision figures Baptism, so also the Adjuncts of the
 " circumcised shall signify something spiritual in the Ad-
 " herents of Baptism: and therefore as Infants were cir-
 " cumcised, so spiritual Infants should be baptized, which
 " is spiritual Circumcision; for therefore Babes had the
 " Ministry of the Type, to signify that we must, when we
 " give our Names to Christ, become Children in Malice,
 " and then the Type is made compleat.

Thus, as I have formerly said, the worthy Doctor hath
 given you a full Answer to all you have said concerning your
 Arguments for Baptism coming in the room of, or being a
 Figure of Circumcision. But to proceed.

5. If Baptism and Circumcision were both in full force
 together for some time, then Baptism is not the Antitype
 of, nor came in the room of Circumcision.

But Baptism and Circumcision were both in full force to-
 gether for some time; therefore Baptism is no Antitype
 of, nor came in the room of Circumcision.

The *Minor* is undeniable: Was not Baptism in full force
 from the time that *John* received it from Heaven, and ad-
 ministrated it on the People? And did not Christ by his
 Disciples baptize many Persons, nay more Disciples than
John? as it is said *John* 4. 1, 2. and was not Circumcision
 then in full force too, and so abode till Christ took it away
 by nailing it with all other Jewish Rites to his Cross?

And

And as to the Sequel of the *Major*, that cannot be denied: for if one thing cannot come in the room and place of another, till the other is actually and legally removed, and took out of the way, which is plain; then since these two Rites had a Being together, the *Major* is undeniable. A Type can abide no longer than till the Antitype is come, therefore Baptism is not the Antitype of Circumcision, or came not in the room and place thereof; the Antitype of which, or that which came in the room of the Circumcision of the Flesh, is the Circumcision of the Heart, not in the Flesh but in the Spirit, *whose Praise is not of Men, but of God.*

6. And indeed how one thing that was a Figure or Shadow should come in the room, or be the Antitype of another thing which is a Figure or Shadow, no wise Man can see Reason to believe. And thus your great Text, *Col. 2. 11, 12.* is plainly and honestly opened, according to the scope and main drift of the Spirit of God therein, and your great Pillar for your Scriptureless Practice of Babes Baptism, razed and utterly overthrown.

I have met with an Answer given to the like pretended Proof for Pedit-baptism, written by a most Learned and Reverend Author. The Argument and Answer I have been at the pains to transcribe, which take here as followeth.

The Argument runs thus, *viz.*

“ To them to whom Circumcision did agree, to them Baptism doth agree; but Circumcision did agree to Infants; therefore also Baptism, &c.

“ The *Major* he endeavours thus to prove, *i. e.* If the Baptism of Christ succeeds in the room and place of Circumcision, then Baptism belongs to them that Circumcision belonged to: but the Antecedent is true, therefore the Consequent. The *Minor* he says is proved from *Col. 2. 12.* ’tis said the *Colossians* were circumcised because baptized.

Ans. This Argument supposeth Baptism to succeed in the room of Circumcision, which may be understood many ways.

1. So as that the sense be, that those Persons may be baptized, which heretofore by God’s Appointment were to be circumcised, and in this sense the Argument must proceed, if it conclude to the purpose: but in this sense it is false, for Females were not circumcised, which yet were baptized,

baptized, as *Acts* 8. 12, 13, 14. & 16. 14, 15. and Believers out of *Abraham's* House, as *Lot*, *Melchisedec*, *Joh*, were not to be circumcised, but believing Gentiles are universally to be baptized.

2. It may be so understood as if the Rite of Baptism then began when the Rite of Circumcision did, or was to end: but this is not to be said; for *John* Baptist and Christ's Disciples baptized, *Joh*. 4. 1, 2. before Circumcision of right ceased.

3. It may be understood as if Baptism did succeed in the place of Circumcision in respect of its Signification, which is true in some things, but not in others. First, both might signify the Sanctification of the Heart, and this is all may be concluded out of that place alledged, *Col*. 2. 11, 12. to which I think meet to add, that if that Text be looked into, the Apostle speaks not of Circumcision, but of Christ; because in him we are compleat, and by whose Circumcision we are said to put off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh: nor doth the Text say we are circumcised, because we are baptized, but that we are compleat in Christ, because we are circumcised in him, and buried with him in Baptism; in which, or in whom ye are also risen together, through the Faith of the Operation of God that raised him from the Dead.

In some things Baptism doth not succeed in the place of Circumcision, in respect of Signification. For,

1. Circumcision did signify Christ to come of *Isaac* according to the Flesh, *Gen*. 10. 11. but Baptism doth not signify this, but points at his Incarnation, Death and Resurrection.

2. Circumcision was a Sign that the *Israelites* were a People separated from all Nations, *Rom*. 3. 1. but Baptism signifies, that all that believe, whether Jews or Gentiles, are one in Christ, *Gal*. 3. 28.

3. Circumcision signified, that *Moses* his Law was to be observed, *Gal*. 5. 3. but Baptism doth signify, that *Moses* his Law is abolished, and the Doctrine of Christ established.

4. Circumcision signified the Promise of the Land of *Canaan*, but Baptism Eternal Life by Christ.

And indeed, saith he, if this Argument be not warily and restrainedly understood, an Egg is laid, out of which manifest Judaism may be hatched: but if it be taken restrainedly, it no more follows thence, but that Baptism and Circum-

Circumcision in some things hold forth the same, which is more plainly said of *Noah's Ark*, 1 *Pet.* 3. 21. and of the Red Sea and Cloud, 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. and yet we say not that Baptism succeeded in their place, much less do we infer any Rite to be instituted in their stead, respecting the same Persons; yea verily it is to be seriously thought on,

1. That by such Arguments drawn from Analogies not conceived by the Holy Ghost, but drawn out of our Wit, a new kind of instituting Right (*viz.* from Analogies) is brought in, besides our Lord's Precepts and the Apostles Examples.

2. This being once said, by a like Parity of Reason and arguing, it will be lawful to bring into the Christian Church under other Names and Forms, the whole Burden of *Jewish Rites*, yea almost out of what you will, to conclude, what you will; for who shall put a Bound to Mens feigning Analogies, when they go beyond the Lord's Precepts, and the Apostles Examples? It is well known that the Divine Appointment of Tithes to be paid, and many other things in the Writings of Divines are asserted by this kind of Argument, beside the Rule of the Lord's Precepts, and the Apostles Examples.

3. Thereby will the Opinion of the Papists be confirmed, who affirm the Sacraments of the Jews to be Types of the Sacraments of Christians, which is rejected by those Divines that dispute against *Bellarmino*.

4. This manner of arguing will countenance the Arguments of the Papists for an universal Bishop, because the Jews had such, and justify a Linen Garment at Mass, because there was such among the Jews, and for holy Water, Purification of Women, Easter, Pentecost, &c. for which the Papists do in like manner argue, as appears out of *Durandus's* Rationals and other Interpreters of Rituals among the Papists. Yea what hinders but we may give Children the Lord's-Supper, if we argue this way, since *Samuel*, *Jesus Christ*, &c. under Age, were Partakers of the Passover? and of right all the Males were thrice in the Year to appear before the Lord; and therefore it is certain they did eat the Passover: and it shall be afterwards shewed, 1 *Cor.* 11. 28. the place will not avoid this Inconvenience, if the Text, *Mat.* 28. 29. may be shifted off, as Pseudo-baptists use to do. Lest any Man take this for a light Suggestion, I will add that

that Grave, Godly and Learned Men have often warned that we are to take heed, that we do not rashly frame Arguments from Analogy: Among others in their late Writings in the English Tongue, *John Paget* in his Defence of Church-Government, *Part 1. cap. 3. p. 8.* and elsewhere. *John Ball* in his Reply to the Answer of the *New-England Elders* unto the nine Positions, *Post. 2. p. 14.*

Lastly; It is to be considered again and again, how by these Argumentations the Consciences of Men may be freed from the danger of Will-worship, and polluting so remarkable an Ordinance of Christ as Baptism is: Especially the Care lies on them, who by Prayer, Sermons, Writings, Covenants and Oaths, do deter Christians from Human Inventions in God's Worship, diligently, and it is to be hoped sincerely.

We further object, "That there was a Command for Circumcision of Infants, but there is no Command for the baptizing of them."

You answer, "The New Testament mentions but little of Infants, because so much mention is made of them in the Old Testament, which saith plainly, that the Children of the Faithful are in God's Covenant, and that the Seal of the Covenant belongeth unto them."

"Neither the Old Testament only, nor the New Testament only (say you) but both together, comprehend the Rule of Faith and Obedience. The Jews deny the New Testament, and some Christians among us (say you) deny the Old Testament in respect of Infant-Pri-
vileges."

Ans. 1. You seem here to deny Infant-Baptism to be found in the New Testament, therefore would have us go to *Gen. 17.* for it: Strange case! that a pure Gospel-Ordinance that is of meer positive Right can be found in the Old Testament.

2. Sir, tho the Old Testament and New together is a Rule of Faith and Obedience in many things, especially in pure Moral Precepts; yet, Sir, in Precepts meerly positive, I deny the Old Testament is any Rule to us: we are not obliged to Circumcision, the Passover and Sacrifices, &c. by virtue of the Old Testament, because they only belong to the Old Covenant-Time; and as to Baptism and the Lord's-Supper, they that lived under the Old Testament were not oblig'd to them, because these are
pure

pure Gospel-Precepts; and the New Testament only is our Rule, and a perfect Rule too upon this account. If therefore you cannot find Infants Baptism in the New Testament, you and your Childish Baptism is gone for ever.

3. The Old Testament doth not say the Children of the Faithful, as such, were in the Covenant of Grace, tho they were in the Legal Covenant; but we have proved if they were, yet that doth not prove they ought to be baptized, because the Covenant of Grace, as such, gives no right to Baptism, but Christ's positive Command.

Now these things being considered, what signifies all Mr. Owen hath said concerning Circumcision, tho it signified some things that Baptism also doth signify, if they differ in so many respects, and there is no Institution of Christ for Infant-Baptism, as there was for the Male Children of the Jews to be circumcised; Circumcision or Baptism being neither of them moral, but meer positive Precepts? But since Mr. Owen saith in his next Chapter, he shall shew that there is a Command for baptizing Infants; we will see how he proves that.

C H A P. VIII.

Proving that Jesus Christ hath not commanded Infants to be baptized; in Answer to what Mr. Owen affirms in the sixth Chapter of his Book, concerning Christ's Commission, Mat. 28. 19, 20.

YOU begin with the words of Christ's Commission, *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* thinking that he hath there commanded Infants to be baptized. We will read the words of the Commission, *viz. Go ye therefore, and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you, &c.*

"In these words, you say, Christ commandeth, 1. To teach the Nations. 2. To baptize them. 3. To teach them.

"Here

“ Here is, say you, a twofold Teaching, one before Baptism, the other after Baptism, unto the Adult among the unbelieving Gentiles: Teaching precedes Baptism, but to the Children of such Baptism preceded Teaching; in the same manner as *Abraham*, being the Father of the Gentiles, was taught before circumcised, but his Children were circumcised before they were taught. This you say is the Signification of the word, as appeareth.

Ans. 1. I answer, you would have the form of the Commission to run according to your Scriptureless Practice of baptizing of Infants, as you call Sprinkling; but that the Commission is wrested and abused by you to serve your turn, will appear,

1. They that are the only Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission, are, first to be taught, or, as the Greek word is, disciples, or made Disciples, and then baptized: and I will appeal to your Conscience, whether they are not the same Persons that were to be taught before baptized, that our Lord commands to be taught afterwards all other things that he hath commanded baptized Believers to observe and keep. You would have the Parents converted from Heathenism to be taught before baptized, but the Teaching afterwards not to refer to them, but to their Children baptized before taught, or in their Infancy. O what abominable Abuse is this of the great Commission of our blessed Saviour!

1. The Commission runs, Teach them in all Nations, whether Jews or Gentiles.

2. Baptizing them that are taught, or made Disciples by teaching.

3. Teaching them, *i. e.* the same them that were Disciples, baptized.

Dare you invert, nay subvert the sacred Commission, and so make void the Command of God to uphold your own Tradition? Sir, tremble at the thoughts of it!

Ans. 2. That this which we say is the true Purport of the Commission, is acknowledged by Mr. *Perkins*, Mr. *Baxter*, and other Pedo-baptists. Take Mr. *Perkins*'s own words. “ First of all, saith he, 'tis said, Teach them, that is, make them Disciples by teaching them to believe and repent: here, saith he, we are to consider the Order which God observes in making a Covenant with Men in Baptism. First of all, he calls them by his Word and

“ Spirit to believe and repent; then in the second place,
 “ he makes a Promise of Mercy and Forgiveness, and there-
 “ by he seals his Promise by Baptism: They, says he, that
 “ know not, nor consider this Order which God used in co-
 “ venanting with them in Baptism, deal preposterously, over-
 “ slipping the Commandment of repenting and believing,
 “ which is the cause of so much Profaneness in the
 “ World.

Doubtless he said right; for you who baptize Infants that are not capable to repent nor believe, make a multitude of profane Christians in the World, as they are called: Who knows which of the Infants you baptize, God will call, and savingly work Grace in, which should indeed be wrought in all, before they are, according to the direct Order or From of the Commission, or ought to be baptized? O what profane Wretches doth your Practice bring into your Church, if all you baptize you make Members thereof in their Infancy! Mr. *Perkins* doubtless did not foresee how by his honest Exposition of the Commission he overthrew his Infant-Baptism and Church-Membership. Moreover, take Mr. *Richard Baxter's* words, speaking of the Commission Christ gave to his Disciples, *Mat. 28. 19, 20, viz.*

“ Their first Task (saith he) is to make Disciples of
 “ them, which are by Mark called Believers.

“ The second work is to baptize them, whereto is an-
 “ nexed the Promise of Salvation.

“ The third work is to teach them (that are baptized
 “ Believers) all other things which are after to be learned
 “ in the School of Christ. To condemn this Order (saith
 “ he) is to condemn the Rules of Order; for where can
 “ we find it if not here? See Mr. *Baxter's* Right of Bap-
 “ tism, pag. 144, 150. This Man, tho a Pedo-baptist, yet
 “ durst not be so bold as to invert the Order of the Com-
 “ mission, nor do as you do, viz. affirm the Teaching men-
 “ tioned after Baptism, refers not to Believers baptized after
 “ they are made Disciples, but to their Infants baptized, of
 “ which the Commission speaks not one word, nor can it by
 “ any colour of Reason or Consequences be drawn therefrom.
 “ But to prove your false Exposition of the Text, you pro-
 “ ceed to do it, “ First from God's Promise to *Abraham, Isaac*
 “ and *Jacob*, that in their Seed should all the Nations of
 “ the Earth be blessed, *Gen. 18. 18. & 22. 18.* Christ came,
 “ say you, to confirm the Promise unto the Fathers, that
 “ the

“ the Gentiles might glorify God for his Mercy, *Rom. 15.*
 “ 8, 9. If God is not a God to the Gentiles and their
 “ Seed, according to the Promises made to the Fathers,
 “ then, say you, Christ weakeneth and not confirmeth the
 “ Promises : God forbid we should think so, &c.

Ans. 1. God forbid that you should rest always under such dark and cloudy Conceptions of the Covenant and Promises made to the Fathers touching the Gentiles; for the Covenant and Promises made to *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob* were, that the Gentiles, through Faith in Christ, should be Fellow-heirs with the Jews that believed in him, and with the Gentiles that believed also. And thus runs the Covenant of Grace to *Abraham*, &c. and thus it runs to believing Gentiles, that all of them, and their Children that believe, or are in the Election of Grace, shall be saved : And 'tis thus that *all the Nations of the Earth are blessed in Christ, whether Jews or Gentiles, i. e.* all such in all Nations that believe, and are called by the preaching of the Gospel.

2. But because Christ's Church does not now in Gospel-days take in whole Nations and whole Families, as the Jewish Church under the Law did take in the whole Nation of the Jews, and all their Families, doth Christ weaken the Promises? Sir, that external Legal Covenant erected a Typical Church, which Church ceased at the Establishment of the Spiritual Church, which is only Congregational under the Gospel, as I fully proved before.

But furthermore; “ You say, the Apostles understood “ Christ's Command unto them in this sense, and therefore “ they have preached Salvation to those that believed, and “ all theirs, &c.

Ans. The Apostles understood Christ's Command and Commission no doubt, but it appears you understand it not. Did they preach Salvation to Believers, and to all their Children, as such, whether elected or not, called by the Word or Spirit, or not? For this you must prove, or you say nothing; and how absurd would that be should you affirm any such thing? *Peter* speaks of no Promise made to Jews nor Gentiles, and to their Children, but to such of them that the Lord our God shall call. And 'tis directly said that the *Goaler and all his* believed; therefore if you will still affirm, that the Apostles apply'd, as you intimate, *Abraham's* Covenant among the Gentiles unto the Seed, the fleshly Seed of Believers, as such, you do assert an

Untruth, and cast a Lie upon the Apostles through your Ignorance. Prove, if you can, they were to baptize any Person, Adult or others, that believed not, or made not a Confession of their Faith. " Children, you say, are part of the Nations ; for if the Apostles were to baptize all Nations, then they were to baptize Infants also, for Children are a great part of the Nations, near one half.

Ans. 1. 'Tis evident that our Saviour in his great Commission, enjoineth no more to be baptized but such who are first taught, or made Disciples, and this agrees with his own Practice ; *John 4. 1. He made and baptized more Disciples than John* : he first made them Disciples, and then baptized them ; nor were there any in the New Testament baptized, but such who first made a Profession of Faith in Christ. Do you read that those Jews, *Acts 2.* that believed and were baptized, were commanded to baptize their Infants, or that any other baptized Believers among either Jews or Gentiles were commanded so to do ? or have we no perfect Rule left us in the Gospel ? for so it will follow if the Infants of Believers ought to be baptized.

2. If the Commission be so extensive as you affirm, then all the Heathens and Pagans in all Nations that believe not, are to be baptized, and all their Children too, and all Unbelievers Children in Christian Nations. Sir, are not these part of the Nations ? Noble *Britains* ! see the nature of the Pedo-baptists Consequences and Inferences for baptizing Infants. This Inference proves that all People and Nations in the whole World ought to be baptized from the Commission : But I will, as I once did to another Minister, appeal to Mr. *Owen's* Conscience, as he will answer it at Christ's Tribunal, Whether he believes the Commission authorizeth Christ's Disciples to baptize any but such who are first taught, and made Disciples, whom St. *Mark* calls Believers, repeating the words of the same Commission, *Mark 16. 16.*

3. Sir, are the Infants of Believers near one half part of the Nations ? I am afraid you are mistaken, this is the way to make Christ's Flock a great Flock ; but the truth is, you have as much Reason to assert all the Infants of Heathens, Pagans and Unbelievers are to be baptized from the Commission, as the Infants of Believers, and then it may be as you say, viz. they may be near one half of all Nations. But to proceed.

Sir,

Sir, you say, "When God threatens to cut off the Nations from before the *Israelites*, the Children were included; for the Children were not spared any more than the Fathers. On the other side, say you, when Christ commandeth to baptize the Nations for their Salvation, he meaneth the Children as well as their Parents. If a Man would command a Shepherd to shear all his Sheep, and to set on them an Ear-mark to know them from other Sheep; altho the Shepherd had sheared the Sheep and marked them, if he leaves out the Lambs without marking of them, he performeth not his Duty: If he says to the Master, the Lambs were too young for shearing, true saith the Master, but they were not too young for marking, you ought to mark them, for they are a great part of my Flock. If little Children, say you, cannot receive Instruction, they can receive Christ's Mark, even Baptism, by which Christ's Sheep are divided from the Goats of the Devil. The Church of Christ is his Flock, is there no Lambs in this Flock? Christ is the good and faithful Shepherd, who giveth his Life for his Flock, *John* 10, 11. and will he not care for his Lambs and Weaklings of his Flock? yea certainly he shall gather the Lambs with his Arms, and carry them in his Bosom, &c.

Ans. 1. I answer; 'tis a bold Assertion from your Inference and absurd Consequence, drawn from the Commission (as I have shewed) to affirm, when Christ commandeth to baptize the Nations, that he meaneth Children; viz. because they are part of the Nations, but I have answered that already; when Children do believe, they ought from the Commission to be baptized, but not till then.

2. As to your Similitude, 'tis much the same with that Mr. *Bunkin*, a Pede-baptist, hath in his Book which I lately answered. I will recite my Answer to him, which fully answers you both, and all others who talk after this race; he argues from the Commission as you do. Take his Words and my Answer in order, viz.

"The true Reason, saith he, why Christ bid his Disciples first teach and then baptize, was because he was sending his Apostles forth among the Heathens to convert them to Christianity; in which work we all know, that preaching of the Word must go before the Administration of the Sacraments.

“ Should, saith he, the King of *England* send his Ministers into Foreign Plantations to convert the Indians to Christianity, they ought not to be baptized before they are taught and instructed; but when the Parents are proselyted, and make a visible Profession of their Faith, their Children may be baptized, and afterwards instructed; as the Children of the Jewish Proselytes were first circumcised, and then taught: For tho *Abraham* was first taught and then circumcised, yet *Isaac* was first circumcised and then taught: so that the sense of our Saviour is this, Teach such as are capable of teaching, and baptize such as are capable of Baptism.

Answer. 1. I answer, first, how inconsistent is this with the words of the Commission? By virtue of the Commission none ought to be baptized but such that are first taught, or do believe; and therefore some Pedo-baptists pretend that Infants have *Habitual Faith*, Faith in *semin*, &c. but you plead they may be capable of Baptism without Faith, and also contradict the Order of Words in the Commission. Do you not confess by the Order of the Words in the Commission, Teaching ought to go before Baptizing? Sirs, 'tis a sign of a very bad Cause that puts you thus to try your Wits, and after all confound your selves.

2. I ask you how *Abraham* (whom God commanded to be circumcised, as a Seal of the Righteousness of that Faith *HE* had before circumcised) could know he ought to circumcise his Son *Isaac*, &c. who had no such Faith, had not God given him an express Command to do it? Before if he had, he had sinned in doing that which God commanded him not. So, and in like manner, since our Lord Jesus expressly in his Commission, commanded none to be baptized, but such who are first taught, unless he had added, as in *Abraham's* case, *viz.* when an Heathen is converted to the Christian Faith and baptized, you may baptize his Infants also; How dare you make such Additions to Christ's Commission without his Authority, and so make the World believe, if you could, our blessed Saviour gave forth an imperfect Commission to his Disciples, which all Men must confess is the only Warrant and Rule of all Ministers to act by in the case of baptizing to the End of the World? And doth he not say, *Add thou not to his Word, lest he reprove thee, and thou art found to be a Liar*; by fathering that on Christ which he never said nor intended?

“ When

“ When a King, say you, by his Charter or publick
 “ Writing sets at liberty the Inhabitants of some Town,
 “ are not the Children Partakers of the Charter altho their
 “ Names be not particularly in it? So it is here, the King
 “ of Heaven is through the Charter of the Gospel, making
 “ of us, that were Strangers and Foreigners, to become
 “ Fellow-Citizens with the Saints, *Eph. 2. 19.* and to that
 “ end commanding to receive all Nations through Baptism
 “ into the Liberty and Privileges of the City of God; and
 “ will he not receive the Children into the Privileges of
 “ their Parents?

Ans. I answer, if it be so, as you say, in all National
 States, Governments and Constitutions, and Civil Societies,
 what doth this prove touching the case in hand, unless you
 dare undertake to affirm, the Gospel-Church is National
 and not Congregational? Doth the Constitution of the Spi-
 ritual Gospel-Church run as in Human and National Con-
 stitutions? Prove it, for I utterly deny it. Besides, if your
 Infants, as such, are Fellow-Citizens with the Saints, and
 are to partake of all the Privileges of the City of God,
 why do you deny them the Lord's-Supper? your Similitude
 proves no more their right to Baptism, to one Privilege
 than another. I never yet could understand what Spiritual
 or Temporal Privileges any Infant receives in Baptism:
 What good doth that do them that have not the Things sig-
 nified in Baptism? There are great Benefits received in such
 a Grant you speak of in an external Charter; but as God
 hath not commanded Infants to be baptized, so not any
 Benefits can be proved they receive thereby. In this you
 argue as Mr. *Burkit* hath done before you. Reader, take
 his Similitude, *viz.* “ I demand, saith he, whether, ac-
 “ cording to the Mind of God gathered from the words of
 “ the Commission, the Remedy prescribed should be ad-
 “ ministrated only to grown Persons, because they only are
 “ capable of understanding and believing the Virtue and
 “ Efficacy of it? Sure every Rational Man among you
 “ would conclude his Child capable of the Remedy as well
 “ as himself, altho ignorant of the Virtue that is in it, and
 “ only passive in the Administration of it; and that it
 “ would be Cruelty, yea Murder in the Parent to deny
 “ the Application of it to all his Children.

Reply. I stand amazed at such Ignorance and Folly!
 Does it follow, because Children are capable to receive a

Medicine against the Plague, or Bodily Distemper, are they therefore capable of Baptism and the Lord's-Supper? If capable of one, say I, of the other also: For as a Man is required to examine himself, and to discern the Lord's Body in the Lord's-Supper, so he is required to repent and to believe in Christ that comes to Baptism.

I would know how they prove Baptism to be the Medicine appointed to cure the Soul of the Plague of Sin (or, as Mr. Owen says, for their Salvation)? Is not this to blind the Eyes of the poor People, and make them think that an external Ordinance saves the Soul? if not thus, how can it be Cruelty, yea Murder in Parents to deny the Application of Baptism to their Children (as Mr. Burkit says)? The Ancient Fathers from that in *John 6. 53. Unless a Man eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, he hath no Life in him*, gave Infants the Lord's-Supper, thinking our Saviour (like as the Papists do) meant that Sacrament, when indeed he meant only of feeding by Faith on Christ crucified. But however, their Argument for giving Infants one Sacrament, was as good as yours for giving them the other. But when they are as capable to repent and believe, and are helped so to do, as they are, and do eat Bread, or receive a Medicine for a Bodily Distemper, let them have both Baptism and the Lord's-Supper; and till then, if God's Word be the Rule of our Faith and Practice, (and not our own Fancies) they ought to have neither: yet the Remedy or Medicine, which is Christ's Blood, we deny not but dying Infants may be capable of, tho' the way of its Application we know not as to them, that is a Secret as to us. You know the Church of England positively affirms, *Repentance, whereby a Person forsakes Sin; and Faith, whereby he stedfastly believes the Promise of God made to him in that Sacrament*, are required of those that are to be baptized, nay and of little Babes too; therefore the Sureties answer for them, that they do believe and repent, or forsake the Devil and all his Works, &c. the Child answers by Proxy. The Church of England baptizes no Child but as a Believer, and a true Penitent Person. All that are proper Subjects of Baptism are comprehended in the Commission, and must be as such, whether Adult or Infants, who profess Faith and Repentance. But you, it may be, foresaw the Snake in the Grass, viz. That Godfathers and Godmothers is a Tradition, and none of God's Appointment; nor are they

they able to perform those things for the Child which they promise for him, and in his Name: And therefore make use of another Argument, and would have them baptized without Faith, or upon their Parents Faith, of which the Church of *England* speaks nothing.

As to your Comparison it is not worth mentioning: Baptism, as I have told you, doth not cure the Soul of Sin, or save any Person, but it's the Blood of Christ applied by Faith. Nor that we say no Child can have the Benefit of that Sovereign Remedy, because not capable to believe, by reason Men and Women must receive it by Faith, or perish.

God, as Dr. *Taylor* observes, may have many ways to magnify his Grace, through Jesus Christ, to them, which we know not of, who die in their Infancy; yet have we no Authority to baptize them any more than to give them the Lord's-Supper.

Pedo-baptists talk at a strange rate, as if they regarded not what they say or affirm, while they bring Similitudes to teach People to believe Baptism is the Balm to cure the Contagion of Sin, and as if the Application of it saved a little Babe from Hell, and they guilty of murdering the Souls of their Children who deny to baptize them. I had thought they would not have laid greater Stress upon Childrens Baptism, than on Childrens Circumcision, since they would fain have them run Parallel-wise.

Pray, what became of the Jews Female Infants, were they damned? and what became of their Male Infants, who died before eight days old? for they broke God's Law if they circumcised them (tho sick and like to die) if they were not full eight days old. Let such blush for the sake of their precious Souls, and take more care for the time to come, to what they write and preach.

I am grieved to see my blessed Master's great Commission thus inverted and abused. Suppose the King should send you with a Commission into a remote Plantation, and command you to act and do exactly according to the express words of the Commission, *not to add to it nor diminish from it*, on pain of being cast out of his Favour, and incurring his Wrath and Curse, durst you do otherwise in any thing, under pretence it was his meaning; whereas he plainly and fully in his Commission expressed in the Affirmative, how and what you should do in all Matters and Things, and forbade you to add thereto? Read Rev. 22. 18. *For I testify unto every Man*

Man that heareth the words of the Prophecy of this Book, If any Man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him all the Plagues that are written in this Book. Who told you what you say is the sense of our Saviour? Can any Man once think, since the Commission of Christ is a pure Gospel-Commission, and contains meer positive Laws and Rules, no ways referring to, nor depending on the Law or Command God gave to Abraham, that what you say can be true, and the Conclusion safe, certain and warrantable? May not another say, with as good Authority, that our Saviour commands his Disciples to baptize all Nations both Parents and Children too, whether they will or not, whether they believe or not, whether Jews or Gentiles, Turks or Pagans? I wonder you are not afraid who take liberty after this sort, to sport (as it were) and play with, invert, alter and add unto the sacred Commission of the jealous God, and great King of Heaven and Earth!

“ 1. You confess Christ’s Sheep came up from the washing, whereof every one bear Twins, and there is none barren among them; Cant. 6. 6. Let therefore the Lambs, say you, be washed, as they are a great part of the Flock.

I answer; Infants, as such, by your own words cannot be Christ’s Sheep, nor Lambs; for all his Sheep and Lambs that are washed are fruitful, and none are barren among them. Are Infants fruitful to Christ? Can they bring forth Twins? Sir, Metaphors go not on all four, (as we used to say); the Lambs of Christ, viz. weak and young Christians, may be as fruitful in Holiness as Sheep, viz. old experienced Christians. But how can you prove Baptism washes your Infants from Sin? actual Sin they have none: Doth it wash away Original Sin? dare you say that? The antient erring Fathers that brought it in, affirmed that Baptism did wash away Original Sin in Infants; but do you believe that they spoke Truth in so saying? “ Christ’s Lambs, you say, are capable to be fed by the Word and Sacrament. Are Infants capable to hear the Word, and partake of the Sacraments? If of one, of both. Sir, Christ’s Lambs are *new born Babes*, not new born by Natural Generation, but by Regeneration, as I have shewed.

“ You

“ You say, that the Gentile Church should not come short of the Privileges of the old *Jerusalem*, or *Jewish Church*; and that the desolate hath more Children than she that hath an Husband, *Gal. 4. 27.* and hence affirm, if Children of the Christian Church enjoy not the Privilege of their Fathers, she hath many less Children than the old *Jerusalem-Church* had.

Ans. I answer; the Gentile Church according to God's gracious Promise may be more than the Jewish was, when the Fulness of the Gentiles are come in, and yet no Infants Members of it.

Nay, there is ground to believe in the Primitive Times there were more converted among the Gentiles, than were amongst the Jews; but still I find you harp on the old String; ~~in~~ that if the Gospel-Church be not National, and enjoy as many outward and external Privileges as the Jewish did, her Privileges are less: but you consider not the Nature, Quality and Glory of the Gospel-Church, and wherein her Privileges excel the Legal Church of old *Jerusalem*.

“ You say, when Christ commandeth to teach all Nations before baptized, and after that their baptizing, his meaning is, teach and baptize to plant the Church, and baptize and teach to continue the Church planted among the Gentiles.

Ans. 1. I am grieved to think how bold you are in asserting that to be Christ's meaning which you affirm, which can no ways be gathered from his Commission, but 'tis directly contrary to the express words thereof, and also to the Nature of the Gospel-Church's Constitution. But you affirm what you please, and prove nothing.

2. It appears by your words, the Gospel-Church in its first Constitution, or first planting, was by Regeneration, consisting only of believing Men and Women, baptized on the Profession of their Faith, or after they were made Disciples; but after its first Constitution, or first Plantation, it was to consist of the Fleshly or Carnal Seed, and so made National, yea and to be made up of whole Nations. Pray, Sir, since the great Commission, *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* proves nothing of this, nor hath the Lord Jesus given out another Commission to nullify his first; What ground have you to affirm so presumptuously any such thing? Dare you add and diminish to God's Word, nay alter Christ's last Will and

and Testament in his grand Commission? Tremble at the thoughts of what you endeavour to do! Sir, the New Testament about Church-Constitution, &c. is a perfect Rule to the End of the World; and as the first Gospel-Church after Christ's Ascension at *Jerusalem*, was constituted, so ought all Churches to be constituted, and so to continue unto the second coming of Christ. The Ordinances are to be kept, as to the Subject and Mode of Administration, as they were first delivered to the Saints: See *1 Cor. 11. 2.* *Now I praise you, Brethren, that you remember me in all things, and keep the Ordinances as I delivered them to you.*

Therefore in direct Opposition to what you say in the close of your sixth Chapter, I affirm from the Authority of Christ's Commission, and from the nature of the Constitution of the Gospel-Church, that as Teaching went before Baptizing for the planting of the Church in the Primitive Time, so Teaching is to go before Baptizing in planting and continuing of the Church unto the End of the World; and that the Teaching that is mentioned in order of Words in the Commission after Baptizing, doth not refer to Infants of Believers, or any other Infants; but, as Mr. *Baxter* observes, to such baptized Believers, who, after they were baptized, ought to be taught all other things in the School of Christ, which he commanded his Disciples to observe, and to which, if they thus act, he subjoined his gracious Promise, *Lo, I am with you always, to the End of the World; Mat. 28. 20.*

C H A P. IX.

In Answer to Mr. James Owen's seventh Chapter : proving that the Children of the Faithful ought not to be baptized, because they are said to be holy ; wherein 1 Cor. 7. 14. is examined, and clearly explained, with the sense of many learned Men, both Pædo-baptists and others, on the said Text.

MR. James Owen thus begins in his seventh Chapter, viz.
 " If the Children of the Faithful are holy, then
 " Baptism appertaineth unto them ; for all confess that
 " Holiness gives Right to Baptism, if they allow that
 " Faith gives Right, which is the Root of Holiness in the
 " Adult.

Ans. We do deny that Holiness (I mean true Gospel-Holiness) simply in it self, without Christ's Command, gives right to Baptism. No, Sir, you go too fast ; Holiness did not give right to Circumcision, but the meer positive Command of God to Abraham : for if it did, Lot, Job, &c. had as much right to Circumcision, and their Male Infants, as Abraham and his Male Infants ; but that Holiness gave no right to Circumcision, simply considered in it self, appears, because, as I have before shewed, all the Male Infants of those wicked Persons that sprang from Abraham's Loins by Natural Generation, had as undoubted right to Circumcision, by virtue of God's Command to Abraham, as had those holy Mens Male Children that were of his Natural Seed. Moreover, 'tis neither Faith, the Seed, nor Holiness the Fruit, that gives right to Baptism, simply considered, but the positive Command of Jesus Christ, which, I affirm, indeed runs to such who have Faith, Repentance, and true actual Holiness, but not a Civil or Matrimonial Holiness, as this is of which the Apostle speaks, 1 Cor. 7. 14. as will appear by and by ; *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.*

" But

“ But how will it appear that they (*i. e.* that Children)
 “ are holy, say you? the Holy Ghost saith so in 1 Cor. 7.
 “ 14. *Else were your Children unclean, but now are they holy.*
 “ The Apostle in these words, say you, answereth a Que-
 “ stion proposed by the believing *Corinthians*, Whether it
 “ was lawful for them to live in the State of Matrimony
 “ with those that were Infidels? they questioned this not
 “ without Cause, because *Ezra* commanded both the Idola-
 “ trous Wives and Children to be cast off, *Ezra* 9. 1, 2, 3, 4.
 “ *Paul*, say you, answereth, that they ought not to do the
 “ like; because the unbelieving Husband is sanctified by the
 “ believing Wife, and the unbelieving Wife is sanctified by
 “ the believing Husband.

2. You say that Children born in such a State are holy,
 as if both were believing; and this you deny to be Legi-
 timation, or not being Bastards, but that it is a Federal or
 Covenant Holiness. Such that were not in God's Covenant
 you intimate were unclean, *Isa.* 52. 1.

Ans. 1. Prove your Infants, as such, are in the Cove-
 nant of Grace. We deny not but all Elect Infants are de-
 cretively in that Covenant; but are your Infants, or Infants
 of the Faithful, as such, in the Covenant of Grace? If not,
 they are not in this sense holy.

2. Are there not many Children of Unbelievers elected?
 If so, are they not holy also? and if so, why not bap-
 tized as well as your Infants, by your Argument from
 hence?

3. Prove, when you write again, if you can, that there
 is any *External, Relative, Federal Holiness* of Persons or of
 Things in the times of the Gospel, as there was under the
 Law; we deny it. I affirm all *External, Relative and Fide-
 ral Holiness* was but a Ceremonial Typical Holiness; and
 will you bring in Ceremonial Relative Holiness into the
 Gospel Church? The *Gentiles* and their *Children* being not
 circumcised under the Law, we grant, were in that sense
 unclean: But will you call all Unbelievers Children un-
 clean now; for the Unbelievers Children you deny to be
 Subjects of Baptism.

“ You say they are unclean that are excluded from the
 “ Privileges of the Church of God, it was not for any
 “ unclean Person to come into the Congregation, altho,
 “ say you, their Uncleanness was but Ceremonial.

Ans. Sir, God shewed *Peter* that Jews and Gentiles are now all one in Gospel-times : Circumcision nor Uncircumcision renders Persons clean or unclean. None now are cleansed or accounted clean, but such who believe, or have Faith in Christ. All that you say about unclean Persons, and things under the Law, signifies nothing to the purpose in hand, because the Holiness under the Law was either Ceremonial or Typical, which none can or dare plead for under the Gospel-Dispensation, seeing the Substance and Antitype is now come.

1. Now in Gospel-times there is no Ceremonial Unclean-ness of Persons ; and therefore in that respect no Holiness of Persons. The *Lep*er was unclean, and he that touch'd a dead Corps was unclean, &c. *Swines Flesh* was unclean, and many other Beasts, that are not so now. The First-born was holy then, but not so now.

2. There was Pollution or Uncleaness of Places ; the House of a Leper was unclean, and his Garments unclean. So there was Holiness of Places, the *Sanctuary* was holy, the *Temple* was holy, which were either by external Consecration, or typically so : But now there is no Place so unclean nor holy. In Gospel-times there's no such Consecration of Places, Persons or Things.

3. Vessels were unclean, and Vessels were holy, but not so under this Dispensation.

4. All the whole House of *Israel* was holy by way of Legal Separation, or Consecration to the Lord, tho they were wicked Persons in respect of Spiritual Sanctification ; but no Member of the Gospel-Church that is a false Professor, is accounted holy, or called holy by the Lord, holy now, because not allowed by the Gospel to be a Member. They are not consecrated to the Lord, or set apart as Members of a Congregational Church under the Gospel, tho such were, if *Israelites*, and of the Jewish Church, called holy by the Lord. Then these things being so, as indeed and in truth it is acknowledged to be, and that by our Godly Brethren, whether *Presbyterians* or *Independants*, what is become of your Exposition of this Text ?

“ You say, little Children are unclean by reason of natural Corruption, but by God's Covenant and washing with Water, &c. they shall be clean.

Ans. 1. True, all that are born of Women are spiritually polluted ; and no doubt but such Infants that die, who

who are saved, God doth, through the Blood of Christ, sanctify them in some mysterious way not known to us, but not by Baptism. Prove that Baptism washes away Sin either in old or young if you can; Who dares to affirm that, when *Peter* saith Baptism washeth not away Sin, or the spiritual Filthiness of the Flesh? *1 Pet. 3. 21.*

2. If God in a Covenant way by Baptism washeth away the Uncleanliness of your Infants, then they were not holy or clean by being born of believing Parents; and if holy because they are their Seed, then no need of Baptism to wash them.

3. And how come they to lose that Holiness afterwards, or is it only the Defilement or Uncleanliness of Actual Sin that lies upon your Children who are polluted, when grown up? for if Baptism washes away any Corruption of Sin in your Infants, 'tis Original Corruption; and doth that return again to them afterwards, so as to be charged upon them? All Sin in true sanctified Persons by Faith in Christ's Blood is washed away, and pardoned, as touching the Guilt and Filth thereof, and shall never so return as to be charged upon them to their Condemnation. Is it thus with your baptized Infants in respect of Original Sin? Speak, Sir, your Mind freely the next time; for, God willing, I shall be ready for you. O when will you cease to corrupt the Word of God by your Tradition!

" You say, *Mr. Tombs* saith, If Children are Members of the visible Church, they ought to be baptized.

I do not remember *Mr. Tombs* saith so, and if they are Members of the visible Church before baptized, they cannot be made Members by Baptism. 'Tis absurd to say to a Man, Come into this House; or to say, Bring such a Child into the House, that is in it before.

For Baptism, say you, is the Door through which we come into the Church of God: Those that say they are not Members of the Church of God, ought, you say, to shew us a plain Scripture for their casting out, if they can, of one Church since *Adam* until this latter Age, of which little Children were Members, &c. And again, you say, if they were cast out, how comes it to pass that there is not one word in Scripture mentioned of it? call for a Scripture from those that would shake your Faith concerning this Prerogative.

Ans. 1.

Answ. 1. I have answered this already. We say and prove that Infants were never received at all into the Gospel-Church, therefore cannot be said to be cast out of it.

2. We deny what you affirm without any Proof, *viz.* That Infants were always Members of the Visible Church since *Adam*: Prove, if you can, they were received as Members before that Typical Church-state which was constituted in *Abraham's* Family.

3. The First-born of *Israel* were holy, the Priests Sons had a right to the Ministry, or Priesthood; shew when they were cast out, and lost both those Prerogatives: and that very way you must take to answer will serve to answer your self in respect of Infants Church-Membership: The Answer must be this, the National Church, and Church-Membership, and Priesthood of the Jews are dissolved, and taken away, and thereby all those external Rites and Prerogatives the Jewish Children had, are gone.

4. These were as Legacies left in the old Will, in the old Testament: but there is a new Will made, or Christ hath made his last Will and Testament, and in this his last Will and Testament, none of these external Rites or Prerogatives (as you call them) are left to Infants. Sir, there is no need in a *new Will*, in the last Will and Testament, to mention Negatives, that is not usual; not what is not left, but only in the Affirmative, what is left: therefore in vain is this Flourish, it will do your People, who are shaken in their Belief of your Tradition, no good.

5. You bid them call for a Scripture from those that oppose their Practice in the Negative, *i. e.* that forbid Infants Church-Membership, or speak where they were cast out. O how dangerous is your Doctrine! May not the Papists say to them also, Where do you read holy Water and holy Garments are forbid? *Moses* commanded the People to be sprinkled with Water, and many other Rites that were among the Jews. We say the Papists call for Scripture where those things are forbid which they have among them, or when God cast them out of the Church? What Human Tradition may not be let into the Church at this Door?

“ You say, the unbelieving Jews would have stumbled if *Paul* had cast out their Children from the Church, and put them in the same Condition as the Children of Infidels.

Ans. 'Tis your mistake, he told them plainly, that the Children of the Flesh were not the Children of God, *i. e.* of the Promise, or of the true Gospel-Church, as such, *Rom. 9. 5, 6, 7.* yet they stumbled not; nay, shewed them they and their Children had no external Privileges above the Gentiles, and that Circumcision availed them nothing; and yet the believing Jews stumbled not at his Doctrine. Sir, no doubt when the Jews are called they will not be of your mind, to plead the old Covenant-right of their Children, being Members, as such.

" You say, That we judg the Adult holy, because they
 " are separated unto the Lord in a Profession of Holiness,
 " altho it be too often an Hypocritical Profession, and
 " shall we not (say you) judg the Children of the Faith-
 " ful to be holy whom God so called? &c.

Ans. 1. God called the whole House of *Israel* holy, because he separated them to himself, both Parents and Children, in a legal Church-state, whether the Parents were Believers, or faithful Persons, or real Saints, or not; but God in the Gospel hath separated none to be Members of the Gospel-Church, but such that are Adult Persons, Believers indued with real Holiness. There is, I tell you again, no Fleshly Relative Federal Holiness under the Dispensation of the Gospel spoken of, disprove it if you can.

2. As to the Holiness of Infants born in lawful Wedlock, they are by the Lord called holy, or a Godly Seed, *Mal. 2. 15.* And did he make one? (*i. e.* one Wife) yet he had the residue of the Spirit; and wherefore one? that he might seek a Godly Seed, that is, a godly or holy Seed by Legitimation; whether the Man or the Woman joined together in holy Matrimony, are Believers or Unbelievers, their Seed is a godly or holy Seed in this respect; and not only the Seed of the Faithful, as you intimate, but the Seed of Unbelievers also, and so not a Federal or Spiritual Holiness, as you would have it.

" The Seed born to the Faithful, say you, in lawful
 " Wedlock are a godly and holy Seed; God calleth such
 " his Children that were born to them, *Ezek. 16. 20, 21.*
 " As it was formerly, even so it is under the New Testa-
 " ment, those that are separated unto the Lord by Bap-
 " tism are called a holy Nation.

Ans. It follows then by your Argument that the Children of Unbelievers born in lawful Wedlock are not a holy Seed,

Seed, that is, they are Bastards or Cast-aways; but you must first prove their Marriage unlawful, and the Holiness here mentioned such you speak of, before you carry this Point.

2. All the Children of the whole House of *Israel* were typically and federally holy then in that National Church: you confound *typical federal Holiness*, and *Matrimonial Holiness* together, which are quite remote in their nature.

3. We say all Believers baptized under the Gospel are spiritually holy, and are called, *1 Pet. 2. 7. a holy Nation, a Royal Priesthood*; but this holy Nation consisteth of none but Adult Persons that believe, who are called *lively Stones building up a spiritual House*, *1 Pet. 2. 5, 6.* not a National Church consisting of Parents and their Fleshly Seed, as such, as under the Law. But if for Argument-sake we should grant all that were in the Gospel-times received as Members in the visible Church, should be called holy in Charity from that Profession they made, yet this will do you no good, until by God's Ordination you can prove that the Infants of Believers were received as Members into the Church in Gospel-times, as they were into the National Church of the Jews under the Law.

" You say, that *Paul* calleth the Christians in his Epistles to the Churches of the Gentiles, Saints, *Rom. 1. 7. 2 Cor. 1. 1.* because they were separated by Covenant, and the Obligation of Baptism, to be the Lord's; and not only the believing Parents, but the Children also are Saints: and for this you cite this Text, *1 Cor. 7. 14. But now are they holy.*

Ans. Prove that the Infants of Believers were comprehended amongst the Saints *Paul* wrote unto, and that they were Church-Members; we utterly deny it, and must People believe it on your bare Testimony? In whose Authority and Power then must stand their Faith in this matter? Sir, you bring the Text in Controversy only to prove your Assertion. Is this to act like a wise and learned Man? If the Holiness in the Text renders Infants to be Saints, prove your Exposition from some other Scripture, which if you cannot do, give up the Point, and confess your Mistake and Ignorance; for no Scripture is of any private Interpretation, *i. e.* but that it may be confirmed by some other place or places of sacred Scripture.

And now because Mr. *Burkitt*, a learned *Pedo-baptist*, in his late Book for Infant-Baptism, argues from this Text as you do, and I have fully in answering him answered you both, I shall here repeat his Arguments, and my Reply: he says, *Paul* in these words answers the *Corinthians* Scruple; you say the Apostle in these words answers a Question proposed by the believing *Corinthians*, viz. Whether such as had *Heathen* and *Infidel* Wives ought to put them away with their Children, as in the days of *Ezra*? The Apostle resolves them that they ought not: For, saith he, the unbelieving Wife is sanctified by the believing Husband. How sanctified? Not in her Name, but in her Use, says Mr. *Burkitt*, so as that they might lawfully cohabit and converse together. And for your Children they are holy, not with an Inherent, Internal, Personal Holiness; for the holiest Man-child is born in Sin, and by Nature a Child of Wrath; but with an External, Relative, Federal Holiness, they are not common and unclean, like the Children of Infidels, but fit to be partakers of the Privileges of the Church, which the Children of Infidels are not. Thus Mr. *Burkitt*.

Now I answer, as I have answered him, you can't be ignorant, but that you know well enough this Text hath been fully opened by divers learned Men as well *Pedo-baptists* as *Anti-pedobaptists*, who prove the Holiness here spoken of, is no such *External Relative Federal Holiness* you dream of. In the first place, you speak right, it was about that very matter that the *Corinthians* wrote to St. *Paul*, viz. Whether the believing Husband might live or cohabit with the unbelieving Wife? &c. So that the Scope and Coherence of the Text opens the matter, and shews what Holiness 'tis the Apostle intends, viz. a Matrimonial Holiness; for should he make their Marriage void, their Children would be unclean or illegitimate, i. e. Bastards: for 'tis true, the case was not as Mr. *Burkitt* says concerning Men and Whores, but about Husbands and Wives, yet he honestly says it was about the Lawfulness of their Marriage, as in *Ezra's* time, when some were commanded to put their Wives away, because their Marriage was unlawful. Now such, say we, as is the Sanctification or Holiness of the unbelieving Wife or Husband, is the Sanctification or Holiness of the Child; and that Mr. *Burkitt* grants to be a Matrimonial Sanctification, so as that they might lawfully cohabit together as Man and Wife. And indeed if the Children had
from

from hence an External Relative Federal Holiness, it would follow also that the unbelieving Husband and Wife had such an External Relative Federal Holiness likewise, and that would open the same Door to baptize the unbelieving Husband or Wife. For may not another Person argue thus, The unbelieving Husband is holy or sanctified by the believing Wife, and therefore by virtue of her Faith may and ought to be baptized? Mr. *Burkitt* reads [to] the believing Husband, and indeed I find the Greek word is elsewhere so rendred.

Let us consider how the Apostle speaks, *viz.* with respect to a thing present or past, therefore he useth the Preterperfect Tense *ἡγιασται*, hath been sanctified: Yea in probability he speaks of Sanctification even when both were Unbelievers, or Infidels, for he saith *ἡγιασται* thrice in the Preterperfect Tense, and he mentions the Unbeliever distinctly, but the Believer without the Expression of his Faith, under the Title of Husband or Wife, and saith *your Children* in Discrimination, with Difference, as well those they had *before* one was a Believer, as *since*; and if so, then the Children born to them whilst both were Unbelievers, were as holy as such born after one became a Believer, and what Holiness was in the Children then think you? even no other than what is in all Children born in lawful Wedlock, whether their Parents are Believers or Unbelievers. And this sense is the more confirmed in that *Ἀγιασμος* Sanctification is the same with Chastity, 1 *Thess.* 4. 7. so that the sense is, the unbelieving Husband is sanctified to his Wife, that is lawfully or chastly used as a Husband, without Fornication in respect of his own Wife, whether Believer or Unbeliever, and therefore not to be refused. And this sense only serves for the Apostle's purpose. The Words are a Reason why they might lawfully live together; the Reason must be taken from that which was not contingent but certain. Therefore let them live together, for tho one be an Unbeliever, yet Marriage continues still, they are Husband and Wife, and sanctified to each other in respect of their chaste Enjoyment of each other, and it is no Sin in them to company together, notwithstanding the Unbelief of one Party: for Marriage is honourable among all, even Unbelievers, and the Bed undefiled, *Heb.* 13. 4. and Holiness and Honour are Terms (as one observes) of like sense in this matter, 1 *Cor.* 4. 7.

Now this being granted, which indeed must of necessity, then the Uncleaness must be understood of Bastardy, and the Holiness of Legitimation, as *Mat. 2. 15.* for no other Holiness necessarily follows to their Children, in that their Parents Marriage is lawful : See the Apostle's Conclusion, *Else were your Children unclean*; you leave out [*Else*] for you mention Children as another Doubt which was in the *Corinthians* about them, which cannot be gathered from the Text nor Scope of it; but [*else*] *were your Children unclean*, is brought in as an Argument to prove that which he saith last, as the Particle *ἐπεὶ ἄρα* shews; for the terms *ἐπεὶ ἄρα* elsewhere are Argumentative as much as *Quoniam*, because then used. So *1 Cor. 15. 14. 29. Rom. 11. 16.* to prove that which went before; and here the Argument is *ab absurdo*, from an Absurdity which would follow if the thing to be proved were not granted; and the Speech must needs be Elliptick, and somewhat is to be repeated to make the Speech full; as when 'tis said, *Rom. 11. 6. Εἰ ὁ χάρις, ἢ ἐν ἡμῶν ἐπεὶ ἡ χάρις ἢ ἐν γένει, to make up the sense, you must add, ἐπεὶ εἰ ἡ ἐξ ἡμῶν, because of Work*; and so here *ἐπεὶ ἄρα, εἰ ὁ ἀπιστος ἢ ἡ πίστις ἐν τῇ γυναικὶ τελευτᾷ ὑμῶν*; for if the unbelieving Husband hath not been sanctified to his Wife, your Children, &c. So that this Argument of the Apostle is entire, viz. If the unbelieving Husband were not sanctified by the Wife, then were your Children unclean; but they are not unclean; Ergo, the unbelieving Husband is sanctified to the Wife. Now the Major of the Syllogism is a Contradiction, the Sequel of it were not true if this Proposition were not true : All the Children of those, whereof the one is not sanctified to the other, are unclean. Now if the Sanctification be here meant of a Matrimonial Sanctification, as I have proved it must, and the Uncleaness be meant of Federal Uncleaness, so as to exclude them out of the Covenant, whether of saving Grace, or Church-Privileges, the Proposition were most false, since the Children of Parents, whereof one was not Matrimonially sanctified to the other, but came together unchastly, as *Pharez* and *Sarah*, *Judah* and *Tamar*, *Jephthah* of *Gilead*, and many others were within the Covenant of saving Grace and Church-Privileges : Therefore to make the Proposition true (without which, the Apostle speaks that which is most false) it must be understood of Uncleaness by Bastardy; for it's true of no other Uncleaness; that all Children of those

Parents,

Parents, whereof the one is not sanctified to the other, are unclean, but now are they holy: The Particle *vuv* *de* but now, is not an Adverb of Time here, as *Beza* rightly speaks, but *ἐναι δὲ* elsewhere: So *vuv* *de* but [now] is a Particle of Reasoning used in the Assumption of Arguments, which shews it is the Assumption of the Apostle's Argument, and therefore it must be understood of Holiness opposite to the Uncleanneſs mentioned; but that being no other than Bastardy, the Holiness can be meant of no other than Legitimation. Nor is this any more an unlikely Sense, ſith Bastards were reckoned among unclean Persons, *Deut.* 23. 2. and the Apostle's Expression is allusive to the Jewish Speaking and Estimation, and why it should be thought strange that Holy should signify Legitimation I know not, whenas *Mal.* 2. 5. *זרע אלהים* a Seed of God, is rendered by some Pede-baptists a Holy Seed, which were such Children (you can't deny) born in lawful Marriage. And that we are not alone touching this sense of the Words and Matter, pray take the Testimony of divers Learned Men, who yet held Infant-Baptism, but found this Text remote to the business of proving it.

Jerom, as I find him quoted by a Learned Man, saith, because of God's Appointment Marriage is holy.

See *Chamier*, who says, *Sic Ambrosium, Thomam, Anselmum exposuisse, & tum Suarez appellat literalem sensum*. That *Ambrose, Thomas, Anselm* so expounded it, and this *Suarez* calls the literal sense.

Melancthon in his Commentary upon this place saith thus, " Therefore *Paul* answers, that the Marriages are not to be
 " pulled asunder for their unlike Opinions of God. The
 " impious Person does not cast away the other: And for
 " Comfort, he adds as a Reason, the unbelieving Husband is
 " sanctified by the believing Wife. Meat is sanctified; for
 " that which is holy in use, is granted to Believers by God:
 " things prohibited under the Law, as Swines Flesh, and
 " a Woman in her Pollution, were called unclean. The
 " Connexion of the Argument is this, If the use of Mar-
 " riage should not please God, your Children would be
 " Bastards, and so unclean; but your Children are not
 " Bastards, therefore the use of Marriage pleaseth God:
 " and how Bastards were unclean in a peculiar matter, the
 " Law shews; *Deut.* ———. Thus far *Melancthon* gives the
 same sense, as *Chamier* observes.

Musculus in his Comment on the place, confesseth that he had formerly abused this place against the *Anabaptists*.

Camera on the place saith, [“ For the unbelieving Husband hath been sanctified] an unusual change of the Tense, that is, sanctified in the lawful use of Marriage; for without this, saith he, it would be that their Children should be unclean, that is, infantous, and not legitimate; whoso are holy (that is, during the Marriage) are without all Blot or Ignominy.

Erasmus upon the place saith thus, “ Infants born of such Parents, as one being a Christian, the other not, are legitimately holy; for the Conversion of either Husband or Wife doth not dissolve the Marriage which was made when both were in Unbelief.

Nay, I find a very learned Divine to affirm, that the Ancients expounded this place no otherwise. None, saith he, that ever I met with expounded it of Federal Holiness, till the Controversy of the *Anabaptists* in Germany arose.

And since Mr. *Burkitt* is so ingenuous as to confess, that the unbelieving Husband is sanctified in respect of Conjugal Relation to the Wife in a way of Marriage, in which so far he agrees with those Learned Men; this being so, how comes he to assert 'tis Federal Holiness that is said to be in the Children?

And by what we say, it appears, it is not a racking of the Scripture to maintain a private Opinion; and tho the word [holy] refers here to what we affirm with others, yet the Apostle speaks truly; tho it is granted the Children of Heathens born in lawful Wedlock, are no more Bastards than the Children of Christians: For if the Marriage were made void, it would render their Children to be unclean, or base born. And what tho the Greek word does signify in so many places, as Mr. *Burkitt* saith, spiritual Sanctification and Separation to God; yet shew us, say I, where it signifies External, Relative, Federal Holiness in the New Testament: yet as one observes, the word is not bound up to that sense as he seems to intimate; for *ἁγνέω* is used for *Castimonia* serva, as *Stephanus* in his *Tesaurus* observes out of *Demosthenes*, κατὰ χάριν, where a Priest of *Bacchus* speaks thus, *ἁγνέω καὶ καθέγγει ἀπὸ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου συνείας*, I am holy and pure from the Company of Man: and the words *ἀγνός*, *ἁγνέω*, *ἁγνίζω*, *ἁγνεία*, chaste, to be chaste,

to make chaste, Chastity, coming from the same Root with *αγιος* holy, whether *αζω* to reverence, or *αγαλλω* to admire, as Grammarians conceive, are used for Holiness very frequently, both in Scripture and in all sorts of Greek Writers : So that what he says as to the Signification of the word *αγια* holy, that it cannot be taken for [legitimate] is fully cleared, and we justified from the Pede-baptists unjust Accusation, viz. that we wrested the word to favour our private Opinion. And now to conclude ; But if it doth signify Holy, as you and your Brethren say, why might not the Children of such as the Apostle speaks of, be said to be holy, as well as the Infidel or unbelieving Wife is said to be sanctified ? What is the difference between holy and sanctified ?

Mr. Owen says, “ If the Children of the Faithful are not
 “ Members of the Church of God, then they are Members
 “ of the Kingdom of Satan, who is the Prince of this
 “ World : If they are without the Church, what hopes of
 “ Salvation have they ? there is no Salvation out of the
 “ Church, Rom. 9. 4.

Ans^r. 1. I hope my *Antagonist* is a *Protestant* ; but I must assure my Reader, he here maintains a *Papish Doctrine*, which all our worthy *Protestant Divines* have protested against. How ! is there no Salvation out of the Visible Church ? God forbid. I doubt not but there are many gracious Persons who shall be certainly saved, and who do truly believe in Christ, that are not Members of any true Gospel Church. Will you exclude all from Salvation that are not Members of your Church ? I cannot think you own the Church of *England* to be a true Gospel-Church, and will you exclude all that are of that Communion from the Kingdom of Heaven ?

2. But as to Infants, they are born Children of Wrath, and actually in Satan's Kingdom, till God is pleased to sanctify them ; and those who die in Infancy that are saved, no doubt he doth sanctify their unclean Nature, but not such as live and remain in Satan's Kingdom, until they are regenerated by the Word and Spirit of God, after they are grown up to Understanding.

3. Therefore some Infants may be Members of the Invisible Church, or Mystical Body of Christ, (tho not Members of the Visible Church) and of this sort there may be among the Children of Unbelievers, as well as among the
 Child-

Children of Believers; for the Election of Grace runs not only to the Seed of the Faithful, say what you please, as I said before.

4. Therefore you do not well to call Children Dogs, if they are not in the Pale of the Visible Church.

" You say, the Promises are the Inheritance of the
 " Church, not to those that are without; and therefore,
 " say you, if the Children be without, they are among
 " Dogs, and what Promise belongs to them? *Rev.* 22. 15.
 " and where there is no Promise, there is no hope of Salva-
 " tion, &c.

Ans. 1. I answer, the Promise runs to Christ, and all that the Father hath given him, but we do not know who they are until they believe.

2. The Promises are not the Inheritance of all that are Members of the Visible Church, for they may not belong to some that are in it, and they may belong to some others that are not in it. *You darken Counsel with Words without Knowledge.* For, (1.) You distinguish not between the Visible and Invisible Church. (2.) Also you distinguish not between who are the Lord's decretively, and who are his actually. (3.) Moreover, you distinguish not between external Privileges, and true internal spiritual Privileges. No external Privileges, or outward Church-Membership gives any Man a Right to Salvation, nor puts him under the Promise thereof.

3. There is hope and ground of hope touching the Salvation of dying Infants, tho they are not in Gospel-times of the Visible Church; because Christ saith, *of such belongs the Kingdom of Heaven.* But pray, Sir, take heed of what you say: You cannot prove that our blessed Saviour spake those words only with reference to the Children of Believers. I know no cause why unbelieving Parents should doubt of the Salvation of their dying Infants. They may (so far as I see) have as much ground to hope God's Election may reach their dying Infants, as any Believer can have it may reach to theirs. What if I should exercise so much Charity as to hope that God hath comprehended in his electing Love all the dying Infants both of Believers and Unbelievers, and that through the Blood and Merits of Christ they are sanctified, and shall be all saved?

My Opinion, were it so, could not justly be condemned by any; but I say secret things belong to God, and I shall forbear

forbear to pass any Judgment in the case, but leave it to God; but I am sure no Child shall be damned for the Parent's Fault. Can Parents by baptizing their Infants save them? Or are they Dogs, and must be damned if their Parents baptize them not, and dare not do it because Christ hath not commanded them to baptize them?

4. Sir, what if a Man and his Wife when they were both vile and ungodly People, as bad as any that live on Earth, should beget many Children, and afterwards they both believe and become good Christians, is the State of those Children begotten when they believed good, and they holy? and are the Children they had when they were vile and wicked Persons, bad, nay so bad as they are to be counted *Dogs*? O that God would open your Eyes! Nay, if it were as you intimate, it may be queried, Whether it be not a sinful, a wicked, and an unlawful thing for two ungodly, unbelieving, unfaithful Persons to marry, since they can beget no Children but such as you call *Dogs*; for you will not say their Children are holy, or ought to be baptized, nor are in the Pale of the Church.

But to conclude with this Chapter; let me speak a word to you that are Believers, and also a word to you that are Unbelievers, and I shall pass to the next Argument.

1. To you that are Believers and have Children; if they are holy and Heirs of Heaven, as they are begotten and born of your Bodies, as Mr. *Owen*, and other *Pedobaptists* assert, then you need not trouble your Thoughts about your dying Infants, tho they are not baptized; for 'tis not Baptism makes them holy, by Mr. *Owen's* Concession, but because they are your Children; 'tis by your Faith they are holy, as he blindly supposes.

2. And since Baptism doth not belong to them, Christ no where having commanded you to baptize them, nor can it add any thing to their Salvation; I charge you in the Fear of God baptize them not.

3. But do not believe Mr. *Owen*, nor any other Man in what he says, unless he can prove it from God's Word. I tell you from Christ's own Words you have ground of hope touching the State of your dying Infants, but not because they are your Children, but because *of such belongs the Kingdom of Heaven*, and they may be in God's eternal Election of Grace: For, as Dr. *Taylor* saith, and I mentioned before, God may have many ways to apply the Blood

Blood of Christ to save and sanctify dying Infants, which we know not of ; but we are not any more required to baptize them, or to give them one Sacrament, than we are required to give them the other, viz. the *Lord's-Supper* ; and this he will one day know to be a Truth, tho now he sees it not.

“ O! saith Mr. *Owen*, cast them not out from the Church
 “ of God, out of the Covenant of Salvation ; they are
 “ your dear Children, Children of your Bodies, of your
 “ Vows. O, shew them the Mercy of God ! the Church
 “ of God is willing to receive them : O rent them not
 “ from the Mystical Body, of which they are Members.
 See pag. —

Ans. You Godly Parents take heed what Doctrine you receive, you cannot cast' your Infants out of the Invisible and Mystical Body of Christ, if they are in it, nor cast them out of the Covenant of Salvation : No, no, that's not in the Power of Mortals : We cannot receive them or bring them into the Covenant of Salvation, nor make them Members of Christ's Invisible and Mystical Body. None can do that but God himself, Christ himself ; 'tis preposterous Stuff, strange Doctrine this *poor Man* troubles you with. Good Men may in some things be blinded and misled : Try his Doctrine, search the Scriptures, take nothing upon trust without trial.

As to your bringing of your Children into the Visible Church, so as to be Members thereof, and to have right to the holy Sacraments, they must come in at the Door of Regeneration, not by Generation ; even at the same Door you came in at if you are true Members thereof : and O therefore pray for your Children, they are dear to you, bring them up in the Fear of God, command them to seek after the Knowledge of their Natural State, and to know and believe in Jesus Christ, and set them a good Example. I know not what better Counsel to give you concerning your Children.

Secondly, To you that are Unbelievers who have Children. Do not fear the State of those dear Babes of yours that die in Infancy, you have no cause to doubt of their Happiness, but your Children may be saved that die in their Infancy, as well as the Infants of faithful and godly Parents. Also the Infants of Godly People are no more holy than yours, if your Marriage was good and lawful ; for Marriage

riage is honourable in all; it belongs to Unbelievers, and is God's holy Ordinance to them as well as 'tis to Believers. But O let it be your Care and chief Business to get true Faith in Jesus Christ; for Matrimonial Sanctification in your selves, or the Holiness of Legitimation in your Children will add nothing to yours or their Salvation; but till you and your Off-spring do believe and are spiritually holy, and sanctified by the Blood of Christ, through Faith of the Operation of God, neither you nor they have any right to the Sign, which is Baptism: for as we deny the Infants of Believers, as such, have any right to Baptism, so be sure your Children have no right thereto; yet the Promise is to you and your Children, or Off-spring, wherever the Lord is pleased to call either you or your Children by the preaching of the Word, &c.

C H A P. X.

Proving, in Opposition to what Mr. James Owen saith, that Children have no right to be baptized, altho Christ blessed them.

MR. Owen quotes Mark 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. And they brought little Children to him, that he should touch them, that he would put his Hand upon them, and pray. Mat. 19. 13. And his Disciples rebuked those that brought them; but when Jesus saw it, he was displeased, and said, Suffer little Children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven, &c.

Saith Mr. Owen, " Let us consider in this remarkable Scripture who were those that were brought to the Lord Jesus; the Text says they were little Children, such as were taken up in Arms, as we translate the word *maiden*, therefore, saith he, it being evident that those Children brought, as it is probable, by the Godly Parents unto Christ, were very little, they themselves were not of Age to come unto him, nor profess Faith in him.

" 2. Why were they brought to Christ? that he should put his Hands on them and pray. They that brought them to

" CHAP.

“ Christ did believe they could receive a Blessing by laying of Hands, and Prayers of Christ ; altho the little Children understood not at present what Christ had done to them. As, saith he, Parents brought their Children to Christ to bless them, so do we bring them to Christ by Baptism to receive a Blessing. Why cannot they receive a Blessing from him now, as in the days of his Flesh ? Are his Bowels strained towards them ?

Ans. What doth this prove touching the Lawfulness of Infant-Baptism ? we acknowledg and readily grant that they were little Children that were brought to Christ, and that he laid his Hands upon them, and blessed them ; but is this a Warrant for us to baptize our little Children ?

“ You say, As those Parents brought their Children to Christ to bless them, so do you bring them to Christ by Baptism.

Ans. And with shame you may speak it, unless you had Authority from Christ so to do : Who hath required this thing at your Hands ? May you not, as the *Antient Fathers* did, by the same Argument bring little Children to the Lord Jesus by bringing them to the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ? Also you have as much ground from God's Word to do that, as to bring them to the Sacrament of Baptism.

No doubt they were brought to Christ to be healed of some Bodily Distemper, for the Lord blessed and healed Diseases by laying his Hand on the Sick ; and we all know that they are capable of that Blessing, but not of the holy Sacraments, which alone belong to Adult Persons that believe, and are able to examine themselves. True, Christ's Bowels are not strained now he is in Heaven to young or old, but what of this ? his Wisdom did not lead him to baptize little Children, and he knows how to let out his Bowels towards them without your teaching him. Will you direct the Almighty, or have Christ to bless an Human Invention ? Were it his Appointment he would no doubt bless it to little Children, but that you will never be able to prove ; and it argues you have a bad Cause in hand, in that you make use of such Childish Arguments to prove it ; and bring Texts so remote from the Business.

“ You say, Christ prayed for them whom the Father had given him, *John 17. 9.* and if the Children of the Faithful are not of the World, but are Christ's, we should
“ suffer

“ suffer them to come to him, and receive his Mark which
 “ is Baptism.

Ans. 1. Are all the Infants of Believers given unto Christ, and so not of this World? Do you believe it? Sir, *all that the Father hath given to Christ, shall come unto him, and every Soul of them shall be saved.* Now do all the Children of the Faithful come to Christ, and shall they all be saved? or are you not to be rebuked and sharply reprov'd for what you write, to blind the Eyes, and deceive the Children of the Faithful, to make them think their State is good and safe, when perhaps they are in the Gall of Bitterness, and Bond of Iniquity? Had not *Abraham an Ishmael, Isaac an Esau, and David an Absalom?* O, and what ungodly Persons do daily still proceed from the Loins of Godly Parents! And how gracious do many Children of wicked Parents prove when grown up!

2. You know not whether these little Children were the Children of Godly Parents or not, nor who they were that brought them to Christ; their Parents might be ungodly as far as we know, and yet some of their Relations, Kindred, or Neighbours might believe that Christ would bless them, and heal them; therefore they might bring them to Christ.

3. You say Baptism is Christ's Mark; but I have shewed the foolishness of that Assertion: Baptism is no distinguishing Mark that God's Children have on them, but his Mark and Seal is his holy Spirit, and his holy Nature or Image stamp'd upon the Soul.

“ 4. You say, that Christ was very angry with his Disciples for forbidding little Children to come unto him.

Reply. From hence we may gather, it was not the Command of their Master that they should be baptized, or come that way unto him; for if it had, before the faithful Disciples of our Lord would not have once attempted to forbid them to be brought to Christ.

Moreover, it is thought the Reason why the Disciples forbid them to bring little Children to our blessed Lord, might be, lest by their crying they might disturb him, for that we see little Children in a Croud of People are subject to do.

“ But you insist to shew what great Bowels Christ manifested to these little Children, and fain would have it,
 “ because he knew they were in God's Covenant, &c.

Ans. By this you seem to intimate, that all Infants are in Covenant with God ; for, I say again, you cannot prove that these little Children were Children of faithful and holy Persons. However I will add here what I have said in Answer to Mr. *Burkitt* on this Argument, to which, or any other of my Answers he hath not attempted to give any Reply ; but, as I am inform'd, is resolved to let it rest in silence, and write no more on the Subject. Take his Argument from this Text, which is in substance the same that you further insist on about Christ's Bowels and Love to those little Children.

" If Infants, saith he, be capable of Christ's Blessing on Earth, and of his Presence in Heaven ; if they be Subjects of his Kingdom of Grace, and Heirs of his Kingdom of Glory ; then they have an undoubted right to the Privilege of Subjects, among which the Seal of the Covenant is not the least.

Ans. 1. We answer, and argue thus to the first part of the Proposition, *viz.*

If many of the Jews and others who were ungodly Persons, were capable of Christ's Blessings, *i. e.* of being healed of their Bodily Diseases, they were Subjects of Baptism : Is this sound arguing ? What farther Blessing Christ vouchsafed to Infants, when he laid his Hands upon them, we know not, for that was the way Christ took oftentimes in the healing the Sick, and so blessed many Persons that never were baptized, as we read of.

2. We (as I have before told you) do deny Infants are Subjects of the Visible Church ; therefore if by the Kingdom of Grace any intend not that, *they beat the Air* : Alas ! such so arguing beg, and prove not ; besides, it doth not follow, I say again, tho Infants may be Heirs of the Kingdom of Glory, therefore they have an undoubted right to the Privileges of the Subjects of God's Church ; for then it would follow they have right to one Privilege as well as to another, and *are to have Fellowship with the Saints and Household of God*, as well as Baptism.

Mr. *Burkitt* argues further thus, *viz.* " Those whom Christ invites to him, and are received by him, his Ministers may not refuse, nor put from them : But Infants are by Christ invited to him, and were received by him, therefore the Ministers of Christ may not, ought not, durst not refuse them into Communion with them.

Take

Take my Answer.

Ans. 1. Christ invited Multitudes to come unto him, and he received them so far as to feed them with Barley-Loaves and Fishes, and to the Blessing of healing them of their Bodily Distempers: But may his Ministers therefore receive all such into their Communion?

2. In the days of Christ when he was upon Earth, there were many who are said to come unto him, whom he might receive into his Presence and Company, yet his Ministers might not baptize them, nor receive them into their spiritual Communion; nor indeed you dare not so receive Infants, I mean into your Communion of the Lord's-Supper. We read of some Pharisees and Lawyers that came to Christ, and he received them into his Company, who, it appears, came to tempt him. Also the Sadducees are said to come unto him, who said there was no Resurrection; may Christ's Ministers baptize such, and receive them into their Communion? Therefore in Opposition to what Mr. *Burkitt* says in his Book, I affirm, there were then other ordinary ways of coming to Christ than by Admission into his Church: *Christ invited the worst of Sinners unto him*, who nevertheless did not receive him. Therefore there are some who must be excluded whom Jesus Christ graciously inviteth.

Mr. *Burkitt's* Appeal for Proof of this Argument to St. *Mark* 10. 3. *Suffer little Children to come unto me; for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*; doth not his Business; they do not belong to the Kingdom of Grace, *i. e.* the Church; for if they did belong to that, or were of the Visible Church, as such, then he need not by Baptism make them belong to it: If Christ owns them Subjects or Members of his Visible Church, then Pedo-baptists need not add them thereto by Baptism: For if, as they are the Seed of Believers, they are already (*sic fœderis*) not only in Covenant with God, but also belong unto his Kingdom or Church upon Earth, all the World may see that Mr. *Burkitt* goes about to give them that very Right or Privilege which they had before and without Baptism.

“ Doth Christ (saith he) take Children into his Arms, and shall his Church cast them out of her Embraces?

Ans. May I not argue thus, *i. e.* Doth Christ receive all Persons into his Arms of Mercy, to heal their Bodily Distempers, of which perhaps some were wicked and ungodly? And shall

shall the Church refuse to receive all such into her Imbraces? Besides, all those pretended Consequences make no more for Infants to be baptized, than for their receiving the Lord's Supper, and all other Privileges that belong as well as Baptism to Adult Persons who believe or are Disciples.

“ Does Christ, says he, own them for Subjects in his Kingdom, and shall we allow them no better standing “ than in the Devil's Kingdom ?

Ans. Does Christ own Infants to be Subjects of his Kingdom, and yet did not baptize them? (for that he did not) and shall we attempt to baptize them, as if we were wiser than he? I must again turn the Edg of the Sword upon this Matter. If little Children were brought to Christ and he did not baptize them, then we must not; But little Children were brought to Christ and he did not baptize them, therefore we must not. Here is both Truth and Reason in this Argument, as Dr. Taylor confesseth, but none of either in his.

It is confessed by Mr. *Burkitt* himself, That Christ did not baptize those Infants that came to him, and whom he took in his Arms and blessed, because with his own Hands he baptized none at all, *John* 4. 1, 2.

Therefore since Christ who was God, foresaw what Contention would arise about the baptizing of Infants, had it been his Will they should be baptized, would he not at this time put the Matter out of doubt, and have baptized them, or have given Command to his Disciples so to have done?

If therefore Infants be in so good a Condition as he says, *i. e.* Subjects of Christ's Kingdom of Grace, let us let them alone, for we cannot by baptizing them put them into a better State than they are, without any Warrant from Christ; and by baptizing them not, we cannot put them into any worse State or Standing than they are in without it.

Many Pedit-baptists are angry with us, because we say we know not but that the Children of Unbelievers and Infidels may be in a good Condition as well as Children of Believers, tho we deny not but that the Children of Believers have a greater Advantage than the Children of Unbelievers namely, by the Prayers, good Education, and the good Example of their Parents, &c.

But saith Mr. *Burkitt*, " Can any wise or good Man believe, that our Saviour would speak such favourable words of Infants, and his outward Gesture manifest so much good Will towards them, only with an Intent to ensnare and deceive us? doubtless it was to encourage his Ministers to perform all charitable Offices towards them.

Ans. 1. He mistakes; our Saviour speaks very little concerning Infants, and that which is said of them was accidentally spoken, being occasioned by those who brought little Children to him, *which the Disciples forbid*, and from hence he spoke what he did. Moreover, the cause why our Saviour spoke those words, might be more for the sake of Parents, that they might not be afraid touching the Condition of their dying Babes, than to shew any Ordinance belonged to them; for had it been so, doubtless the Disciples would not have forbid those People to bring little Children to Christ. 'Tis therefore an Argument against Infant-Baptism, and not for it, because the Disciples were appointed by their Master to be the Administrators of that Ordinance on such to whom it did of right belong; and had Infants been the Subjects, would they have forbid People to bring Infants to him?

2. We therefore may rather conclude, had they been the Subjects of Baptism, Christ, by not hinting any such thing in the least on this occasion, might rather have left us in a Snare, in speaking nothing of it neither here nor at any other time.

3. Therefore Christ speaking so favourably of Infants, and yet baptizing them not, may teach us to judge favourably of them, and do any charitable Office towards them, but not to presume to give them holy Baptism without Christ's Warrant no more than any other Gospel-Ordinance. 'Tis no matter what *Calvin* spoke, 'tis no Sin to keep such out of Christ's (visible) Fold, whom he has given no Authority to take in: Nor have any People a more charitable Opinion of the State of dying Infants than those still'd *Anabaptists*.

4. Those who are capable of some kind of Blessings of Christ, we have shewed, are notwithstanding not capable of Baptism. We read not the Disciples baptized these little Children, nor any else.

Object. To this he, as you do, answer, Perhaps they were baptized before: But, says Mr. *Burkitt*, it doth not follow, that the Apostles did not baptize those Children, because no mention of it: The Scripture no where tells us that the Apostles themselves were baptized; shall we conclude therefore they were never baptized?

Ans. 'Tis no matter whether we read or read not, that the Apostles were baptized, since we find it was Christ's Precept and Practice to baptize Disciples, or such who did believe in him: We read of multitudes of Disciples that were baptized, and we know the way of Christ was one and the same; that which was the Duty of one Disciple, as a Disciple, was the Duty of every Disciple. We read but of two or three Churches who broke Bread, or celebrated the Lord's-Supper. Could any Pedit-baptist but shew us a Precept for Infant-Baptism, or but one Example or Precedent where one Infant was baptized, we would not doubt but those little Children might be also, but this they cannot do.

And whereas Mr. *Burkitt* and you say, " That there is
" not the same Reason why Infants should be admitted to
" eat the Lord's-Supper, as there is for them to be ad-
" mitted to Baptism.

I answer; We deny it utterly. What tho the one be a Sacrament of Initiation, and the other of Confirmation? Yet pray observe, that Repentance and Faith is required of them that are to be baptized, even actual Faith and Repentance, as well as actual Grace and Examination, &c. to discern the Lord's-Body, in those who are to receive the Lord's-Supper. If all that were to be circumcised, had been required to repent and believe as in the case of Admission to Baptism, something had been said, but the contrary appears. Male-Infants, as such, had a right to that, but have no such right to this.

" You say, Christ did not lay his Hands upon little
" Children to heal them of Sicknes, because the Apostles
" would not have been so cruel as to hinder them to come
" to Christ to heal their Distempers, &c.

Ans. Is it then greater Cruelty to hinder little Children of the Blessing of being healed of Bodily Diseases, than to hinder them of Covenant-Blessings, Spiritual Blessings? How absurdly do you argue!

You add also, " Christ baptized them not at that time; for, say you, they were baptized before by *John the Baptist*, and Christ laid his Hands upon them to bless them; say you, *laying on of Hands followed Baptism*, *Acts 8. 17. Heb. 6. 2.* many of the Anti-pedo baptists own it, for they lay their Hands on those they baptize, you say rebaptize.

Ans. We rebaptize none: Rantism is not Baptism, &c. but you should first prove *John the Baptist* did baptize any Infants, for that you have not done, nor ever can do. We shall see what Proof you have for what you say by and by. As to laying Hands on baptized Believers, the Scriptures you mention prove that an Ordinance of Christ, but not upon Infants; the Apostles never taught or practised any such thing, tho' 'tis true 'tis a *Popish Rite*: for as the Baptism of Believers is corrupted and changed to Infants, so laying on of Hands on baptized Believers is corrupted and changed by the false Church to Infants also.

" You say, The Kingdom of God under the Gospel is made up of Children, and of such that are like to them.

Ans. If by the Kingdom of God you mean the visible Church, 'tis utterly denied; when you write again prove it, that the visible Church under the Gospel is made up of Infants, tho we deny not that the Gospel Church is made up of such, who like little Infants are *meek, humble and harmless* Persons; in Malice all Believers should be as little Children.

C H A P. XI.

In Answer to Mr. James Owen's 9th Chapter and sixth Argument, proving, that Infants ought not to be baptized, although the Gentiles were grafted into the true Olive, when the Jews were broken off; containing a true Exposition of Rom. 11. 15, 16, &c.

ROM. 11. 15, 16, 17. *For if the first Fruit be holy, the Lump is also holy: and if the Root be holy, so are the Branches. And if some of the Branches be broken off, and thou being a wild Olive Tree, wert grafted in amongst them, and with them partakest of the Root and Fatness of the Olive-Tree, &c.*

In this remarkable Scripture the Apostle, you say, sheweth,

“ 1. That the Jews, while they were God's visible Church, were a holy Nation; not only the Parents, but the Children also, all the Branches were holy, because the Root was holy; the Root was Abraham, and others of the Fathers, Rom. 11. 28. Isa. 51. 1, 2. because they were in Abraham's Covenant, the Parents and the Children were holy, being separated a peculiar People unto God: In this sense they were holy; because the first Fruit, even Abraham, was holy, the whole Lump also was holy. Abraham believed and received God's Covenant to him and his Seed, being the first Fruit of the Jews; even as the first Fruits offered to the Lord, Levit. 2. 3, 9, 10, 17. so did the Faith of the first Parents sanctify the whole Nation of the Jews, not with true Holiness in the Heart, for many of them were wicked, but with a federal Holiness, because they and their Seed were separated to the Lord in an external Covenant.

“ 2. You say; They that received the Gospel continued to be holy Branches upon the same holy Root; they and their Seed were in Abraham's Covenant, even as before,

“ before, nor one Branch was cut off, neither small or great, until they refused the Lord Jesus, they that were broken off were cut off by reason of Unbelief, *Rom. 11. 20.* *Because of their Unbelief they were broken off;* therefore they that believed in Christ were not cut off, and if they were not cut off, then they were in Union with the Root, as being Partakers of the Fateness of the Root, as before they and their Children were Partakers of their old Privileges, being holy Branches not broken off. The Anti-pedo-baptists do cut off the Branches whom God never cut off, *viz.* the Seed of the Faithful; they lop off the fruitful Tree in the Vineyard, and lay the Ax upon the Root, and upon the Branches thereof in a presumptuous manner.

“ 3. You say the Jews refused the Grace of God in the Gospel; God refused that Nation, not only the Parents but the Children also. God spared not the Natural Branches, but hath broken them off, *Rom. 11. 17.* not from the invisible Church, of which the unbelieving were not Members. None are Members of the invisible Church saving the Elect. God refused none of the Parents, *Rom. 11. 2. 2 Tim. 2. 9.* God hath not cast away his People which he foreknew; the Foundation of God standeth sure: therefore they were cut off through Unbelief from being the visible Church, of the which they and their Children were Members.

“ The Gentiles, were grafted in their room, *Rom. 11. 17.* they and their Children were broken off, and the Gentiles and their Children shall be grafted in, for they were received into the same Privileges which the Jews had — the same Privileges belong unto them in the same Latitude, for they were grafted into that Root from which the Jews were cut off, &c.

Ans. 1. I answer; you had need be a good Expofitor of a Metaphorical Place of Scripture, that ground so great an Argument upon it; we used to say Metaphors serve for Illustration, but are not Argumentative, they do not prove a Truth, tho they may illustrate it; therefore 'tis strange you build an Institution, an Ordinance, nay a Sacrament, as it is called, upon a Metaphorical place of Scripture.

2. Many things in *Metaphorical* and *Parabolical* Scripture run not parallel with that they are brought to illustrate,

illustrate, therefore run not on all four, as Divines observe.

3. We will however examine your pretended Argument from this mysterious place of Scripture. It was well if you had minded what St. Paul speaks in the 25th Verse, *For I would not, Brethren, that you should be ignorant of this great Mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own Conceits, &c.* But that you are ignorant of this mysterious Text, and Matter contained in it, I doubt not but to make appear, and it is to be feared from thence you are wise in your own Apprehension. But to proceed, if all the Branches, viz. the Children of the whole House of Israel, were holy, then the Children of the unbelieving Jews were holy also, who were of that Lump you speak of; and if so, why do you argue from hence for the federal Holiness of the Children of Believers? Sir, under the Law there was a Federal and Typical Holiness, but the Children of Godly Parents now, or the whole Lump, you say, is holy, by reason of the Covenant made with Abraham; tho not spiritually holy, yet federally holy, because all that were in that external Covenant and Church-state of the Jews were holy. If by Federal Holiness, which was in the Jewish Church, you mean no more than external Church-Membership, not spiritual Holiness and spiritual Privileges, then their Loss by being cut off is not so great as the Apostle intimates, nor is the Fatness of Abraham's Covenant and true Olive so sweet as you elsewhere affirm, nor is it so great a Blessing for the Gentiles to be grafted into such a Root or Olive-Tree that affords no better Oil. What signifies Federal External Holiness without true Spiritual Holiness? it will do us nor our Children no more good than the same External, Federal or Covenant Holiness did do to the wicked Jews and their Children under the Law, no nor so much neither; for they had by that external Covenant many Earthly or External Blessings, as they were possessed by that Covenant of the Land of Canaan, and Common-wealth of the Jews, as a National Church; which external Privileges believing nor unbelieving Gentiles and their Seed have not under the Gospel, therefore that is not true which you affirm, viz. *The same Privileges belonging to the Gentiles and their Children, in the same Latitude, for they were grafted into the same Root.*

Sir, have we Gentiles a Worldly Sanctuary, a holy external Temple, a Land flowing with Milk and Honey, a Political Government and Governours from among our selves as we are a Gospel-Church by God's Ordination, as the Jews had? Are we under the Promises of heaping up Gold and Silver, and if we are obedient to live in Peace, and to be saved from our external Enemies, for many such like Privileges and Promises the Jews and their Children had under the Law? The truth is, your External, Federal Holiness, Root and Olive-Tree will afford but little Fatness either to our selves or Children, considered distinct and apart from Spiritual Blessings and Holiness. What is a simple external Profession good for, without true Grace and a saving Interest in Christ, and Assurance of Eternal Life? What more doth it serve to do than to blind and deceive the Souls of such external and carnal Professors? What is an Ordinance without the God of the Ordinance? What is the Sign without the Thing signified? What is the Lamp without Oil, or a Cabinet without the Jewel, or a Shell without a Kernel, or the Name of a Christian without the true Nature of a Christian?

" You say, The first Parents sanctified the whole Nation of the Jews, not with true Holiness in the Heart, for many of them were wicked, but with a Federal Holiness, because they and their Seed were separated to the Lord in an External Covenant.

I am glad to see you open the Eyes of your People, now they may see what little good that federal Holiness, and the Covenant with *Abraham* can do to their Infants, 'tis but only to give them a Name that they may be called Christians. Is this the Promise that belongs to the Faithful and their Children? Is this the Blessing of *Abraham* that is come upon the Gentiles? Are they not Spiritual Blessings? Is it not Spiritual and Heart-Holiness? Is it only to be in an external manner, by an external Covenant, and visible Profession, separated to be the Lord's, and called his, when indeed and in truth, spiritually and savingly they are not so? Is this that Covenant confirm'd by the Oath of God, that gives you such strong Consolation touching your Infants, as such, as before you pleaded for?

4. Moreover, do you not own by what you here affirm, that there were two Covenants made with *Abraham*, since that Covenant which was made with the whole Lump, or whole

whole House of *Israel*, was, as you positively assert, not a spiritual but an external Covenant? Sure I am you do believe there was a spiritual and an eternal Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* and all his true spiritual Seed, and that he was a Root spiritually holy, by virtue of that spiritual and true Gospel-Covenant God made with him; and as the whole Lump were all federally holy in a Spiritual Sense, as himself was, and as he had first Fruits given to him, who were spiritually and truly holy also, so there are many Branches still that daily spring out of that Spiritual Root and Spiritual Covenant, that are federally and spiritually holy as the Root was holy. Sure there was a Covenant made with *Abraham*, and of which he is considered as a common Root, or common Head, and from which Root and Olive-Tree it is impossible any one of his Spiritual Seed can be cut off; for if not so, *How is the Promise sure to all the Seed?* Rom. 4. 16. and how is that Covenant a ground of strong Consolation to all the Heirs of the Promise? as *Heb.* 6. 17, 18, 19.

5. But the truth is, the purport of your Exposition of this dark Text, all may see is to prove the Gospel-Church to be as extensive, wide and large, or every way of the same Nature and Latitude with the National Church of the Jews; and therefore you plead for the Fleishly Seed, as such, to be received as Members thereof.

Sir, I know you not, but I thought you had held for the Congregational Way; but the truth is, Infants Church-Membership is only calculated for a National Church, and therefore best suits with Presbyterism and Episcopacy.

“ You say, the Jews and their Children were broke off,
“ and the Gentiles and their Children were received into
“ the same Privileges which the Jews had, &c.

Answer 1. If you would prove that the Gospel-Church is National, consisting of whole Parishes, Families and Kingdoms, you must bring Proof for this Constitution from the New Testament: Show, where Christ instituted or ordained such a Church-state, or what whole Gentile Nations, consisting of Believers and their Children, and Unbelievers or ungodly Persons professing Christianity, and their Children, were constituted by the Apostles a Gospel-Church; for evident it is, all believing or godly Jews and their Children, and all ungodly Jews who owned the Jewish Religion, and their Children, were Mem-

Members of the National Church of *Israel* under the Law.

2. Also prove, that if such a Gospel-Church Constitution can be proved out of the New Testament, that therefore all the external Privileges and Rites of the Jews, must belong unto such a Gentile Nation, and Gospel-Church, that did belong to the National Church of the Jews. Must they have the same Rites and Privileges, and yet not the same? Is Baptism Circumcision?

3. If it came, as you dream, in the room of it, then it would follow that Baptism belongs only to Male-Infants; if not so, 'tis not the same Privilege, but differs greatly: you must have therefore some word of Institution, or some good Authority from Christ to enlarge this Privilege, so far as to allow it to Females also.

4. And why this Privilege only? had not the Jews and their Children many other external Privileges besides Circumcision? Why must not the Gentiles, and their Children that are grafted in, as you suppose, in their room, receive all the Privileges as well as one or two? You have done your Work by halves.

5. Besides, what you say, that the first Parents sanctified the whole Nation of the Jews, is false. It was not they that separated or sanctified them but God himself, *i. e.* by his absolute Command and holy Institution; therefore you must prove the like Command and Institution for such a National Church under the Gospel as was under the Law. Sir, I desire no better Task than to prove the Gospel-Church consists of none, by Christ's Appointment and Institution, but only Adult Persons believing and professing Faith in Jesus Christ, incorporated together in a holy Covenant. And when you write again, lay down your Arguments to confute what I here say, and I shall, God sparing my Life, be ready, through his Assistance, to give you an Answer, which will utterly throw away your Infant Church-Membership. And since the old Covenant, and old Covenant Church-state is taken away and dissolved, by the establishing of the Gospel-Covenant, and Gospel-Church, you must bring your Arguments and Proof from Christ's last Will and Testament, or all you do will signify nothing.

Now, Reader, having shewed thee that the Exposition Mr. Owen hath given of this Metaphorical Scripture, is
false

false, and inconsistent with the Truth as it is in Jesus, I shall give thee my Thoughts of the true Purport of it; and in regard I have once done it already in my answering of Mr. *Burkitt*, I shall proceed to lay down his Argument and my Answer, and that will bring me to the Business directly. The Argument which Mr. *Burkitt*, and with him other Pedit-baptists, raises to maintain their Scriptureless Practice of Babes-Baptism from this Text, is this, *viz.*

“ If (saith he) the Infants of Christian Parents are federally holy, then they are Subjects qualified for Baptism: But the Scripture pronounces such Children federally holy; therefore they are qualified for Baptism, and may be admitted, *Rom. II. 16. If the Root be holy, the Branches are also holy, &c.* Where by the Root, saith he, we are to understand *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob*, and by the Branches, their Posterity, the People of the Jews. Now forasmuch (saith he) as the Jews, the Natural Branches, are for their Unbelief broken off, and the believing Gentiles are grafted in their stead, and succeed in their Privileges, in the sense that they were holy, not with an internal and inherent Holiness, passing by Natural Generation from Parent to Child, but with an external Relative Covenant-Holiness, grounded on the Promise made to the Faithful and their Seed.

Ans. 1. I deny the Major, and say, If Children of Believers were federally holy under the Gospel, yet they are not qualified for Baptism, because 'tis not that which gives them right thereto, or qualifies them for it, but what Christ hath ordained and appointed, as the alone proper and meet Qualification, which is not that *External, Relative Covenant-Holiness* he talks of, which the New Testament speaks nothing of, as I shall shew by and by, but *actual Faith, Regeneration, or inherent Holiness*, which is the Thing signified by Baptism; therefore a thousand such Arguments will do no good, since Baptism is of *meer Positive Right*. 'Tis Christ's own Law must decide the Controversy, *viz.* What Qualifications are required of such, who by his Authority and Law ought to be baptized. Let any Pedit-baptist prove, if he can, that such an *External Federal Holiness* qualifies any Person for Gospel-Baptism; for if such Federal and External Holiness qualifies Persons for Baptism, then the Jews, before cast off, might have been admitted to Baptism, since they had then such a kind of Federal

Federal Holiness, which kind of Holiness none can prove Believers Children are said to have under the Gospel; but if it qualified them not for Baptism, it cannot qualify our Children for Baptism: And that it did not qualify them, is evident, see *Mat. 3. 9.* where some of the Branches of this Root came to *John Baptist* to be baptized, and he refused to admit them, with these words, *i. e. Think not to say within your selves, We have Abraham to our Father: For I say, God is able of these Stones to raise up Children to Abraham. Ver. 10. And now also is the Ax laid to the Root of the Tree.* From whence it plainly appears, that that *External Relative Holiness*, which qualified under the Old Testament Persons for Circumcision, and Jewish Church-Membership, will not qualify Old nor Young under the New Testament for Baptism, and Gospel-Church-Membership.

2. I also deny his *Minor*, and say, the Scripture of the New Testament doth not pronounce the Children of believing Parents federally holy: The Text *Rom. 11. 16.* speaks not one word of Infants, nor one word of such a kind of federal Holiness. *Dr. Thomas Goodwin*, who was a very Learned Man, urging that Text, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* (tho a *Pedo-baptist*) *In the New Testament* (saith he) *there is no other Holiness spoken of, but Personal or Real by Regeneration;* about which he challenged all the World to shew to the contrary.

And Sir, with your favour, if you cannot from any place of the New Testament prove there is any such Holiness spoken of, you are to be blamed for bringing in a private and an unwarrantable Interpretation of that Text. I find there are various Interpretations of what is meant by the Root in that place.

1. Some understand it of the Covenant.
2. Some of Christ.
3. Some of *Abraham, Isaac and Jacob.*
4. Some of *Abraham* only.

What if I agree with the last, and say *Abraham* is the Root? But what Root? why, the Root of all his true Spiritual Seed: And if so, the Holiness of the Branches was real in word and spiritual; for such Holiness as is in the Root, is in the Branches: and indeed for want of Faith,

Faith, or of that Real and Spiritual Holiness in many of his Natural Branches (for he was a twofold Root, or Father, as I have before proved) they were rejected or broken off for their *Unbelief*, and the Gentiles by *Faith* were grafted in, they having obtained the Fatness of the Root, or the Faith and Righteousness of their Father *Abraham*, who was the Root or Father of all that believe. The truth is, as Mr. *Tombs* observes, " The Holiness here meant " is, first, in respect of God's Election, *Holiness* personal " and inherent in God's Intention, *Ephes.* 1. 4. Secondly; " It is also Holiness derivative, not from any *Ancestors*, " but *Abraham*, not as a Natural Father, but as a Spiritual " Father, or *Father of the Faithful*; and so derived from " the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*.

And thus it appears you have darkened this illustrious Scripture, thinking to prove a Holiness that the New Testament knows nothing of, applying the *Holiness* in the Text to Federal Relative, &c. Holiness in respect to outward Dispensation only in the visible Church, which is meant of saving Graces, into the invisible, and make every believing Parent alike Head or Root to his Posterity with *Abraham* to his Seed, which we deny.

But let the Jews Covenant and Standing before they were broken off be what it would, I am sure no Gentile is grafted into Christ, but by actual Faith; nor can any be grafted into the Gospel Church without the Profession of such Faith, therefore you do but beat the Air.

The Jews, 'tis true, were broken off by their Unbelief, and were also no more a Church; nor is there any such kind of Church constituted under the Gospel as theirs was, viz. a National Church; for they amongst the Jews, who were the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, receiving Christ by Faith, were planted into the Gospel Church, and between them and Gentile Believers: Now there is no difference, Jew and Gentile stand in the Church now by Faith, not by external Covenant, Privilege, Right or Holiness. Thou standest by Faith, O Believer, Mark! not by Birth-Privilege, but by Faith (saith one) yet not thy Seed by thy Faith, but thou thy self by thine, and they by their own: Faith is that by which thou standing (and not thy Seed) hast right to stand in the Church, and not they: But if thy Seed have Faith, and thou hast none, then they have right in the Church, and thou shalt be excluded. And tho under the Law we deny

deny not, but that the Natural Seed or Progeny of *Abraham* were all holy, with an External, Ceremonial or Typical Holiness; and consequently they were admitted to an external Participation of Church-Privileges; yet now 'tis otherwise, *old things are past away: now we know no Man after the Flesh*, 2 Cor. 5. 16. That Church-state is dissolved, and manner of Admission into it, by external Birth-Privilege, and that this Text doth not help you. I shall further open this place of Scripture.

1. 'Tis evident the Apostle is in the 9th and 10th Chapters to the *Romans* treating of the Election of Grace, and of that Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*; these were his People which he had not cast away, Chap. 10. 1. and of this sort God had 7000 in *Elijah's* days, ver. 4. Even so, saith he, at this present time also there is a Remnant according to the Election of Grace, ver. 5. Hence he says, *What then? Israel hath not obtained, &c. but the Election hath, &c.* ver. 7. He further shews, that abundance of the Natural Seed of *Abraham* were broken off. How are they broken off? Why by their Unbelief, they not receiving Christ, but rejecting the Gospel and new Church-state, were broken off. But that the Gentiles might not boast over them, the Apostle shews there is ground left to believe all those that belong to the Election of Grace, shall in God's due time be brought in, and so partake of the Blessings of the Gospel-Covenant, or Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham*; and to prove this, in ver. 16. he lays down an Argument, *For if the first Fruit be holy, the Lump is also holy; and if the Root be holy, so are the Branches*, ver. 16. by the Root I understand is meant *Abraham*, Root and Father signifying here the same thing, *Abraham* being the Root or Father, as God represents him, of all the Elect, or of such who believe, or the Root of all his true Spiritual Seed.

2. By the first Fruits may be meant *Isaac*, *Jacob*, and the Holy and Elect Patriarchs, for they were given as the first Fruits to *Abraham* of that Covenant and free Promise of God, and these were holy, with a true Spiritual and Internal New-Covenant Holiness.

3. By the Lump he may mean the whole Body of the Elect, or the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, from the time the first Fruits were given him, until the Gospel-day, or whole Body of the true *Israel* of God, who were holy, as the Root and first Fruits were holy.

4. By

4. By the Branches, may be meant the true Elect Seed that were living then in that present time, as *ver. 5.* and these were holy too, even as all the rest, both as the Root, First-fruits and whole Lump or Body were holy: That is, all the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* were like himself, *viz.* holy in a spiritual sense. And now observe, he speaks of some Branches that were broken off; these seemed to be Branches, or the Children of *Abraham*, and so they were according to the Flesh, but were like those Branches in Christ who bear no Fruit, and therefore taken away, *John 15. 2, 3, 4.* he alludes to the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, to whom he stood not as a Spiritual Father, or Root, but as a Natural and Legal Father, as they were a National Church, and sprung from him; and these Branches were all broken off, *viz.* for rejecting Christ. (1.) Not broken off from the Election of Grace, for so that they did not belong. (2.) Nor were they broken off from the Gospel-Church, for they were never grafted into that. But, (3.) broken off from being any more a Church or People in Covenant with God, the whole old State and Constitution being gone; and they not closing in with Christ in the Gospel Dispensation, Grace and Church-state, are said to be broken off as a lost People, because not replanted or implanted into Christ, and the true Gospel-Covenant; the old being gone, quite removed and taken away, they have now no Root to stand upon, having lost their Legal Privileges as *Abraham* was their Father, upon that foot of Account, and they not appearing to be the true Branches or Seed of *Abraham*, as he was the Father of all the Elect Seed, or of all that believe in Jesus Christ, they must of necessity from hence be broken off from being the People of God, or belonging to any Head or Root, in any Covenant-Relation to God at all, the Dispensation being changed, *Old things being gone, and all things being now become new.* But these new State-Blessings, Rights, Church and Church-Privileges are rejected; and thus were some of the Natural Branches broken off, and the Gentiles, who were wild by Nature, *i. e.* never were in any visible Church state with God, nor in any sense related to *Abraham*, as a Root, were grafted into the true Olive Jesus Christ, and into the true Gospel-Church, and so Partakers of the Sap and Fatness of the Root, and of the Olive, that is, of the Spiritual Blessings and Privileges of *Abraham*, and of the Covenant
of

of Grace made with him, and of the sweet Blessings and Privileges of the Gospel Church; and this they receive and partake of, as being first grafted by saving Faith in Christ, and so united to his Mystical Body. But since there are a greater Number of the old Natural Branches that are beloved for their Father's sake, that is, for the sake of *Abraham*, as the Root and Father of all the Elect Seed, they shall in due time be grafted in again, and so become a People visibly owned of God, and in Covenant with him, as all the true Seed now are, and formerly were. And if this be considered, what doth this Text do to prove the Natural Seed of Believers, as such, are in the Gospel-Covenant? for if the Natural Seed of *Abraham* can lay no Claim, nor have any right to Gospel-Privileges, but are gone or broken off, what ground is there for us to think that our Natural Off-springs (as such) should be taken in? The Apostle speaks not of such Branches, or of being holy with an external federal Holiness, but of such a Holiness as was in the Root, viz. *Abraham*, who believed in God; and thus all his true Spiritual Seed (who are actually Branches and in Covenant, being grafted into Christ by Faith) are holy; and also all the Elect Seed of *Abraham*, not yet called, are decretively, or in God's sight so, who calls things that are not, as if they were; they are all holy and beloved for their Father *Abraham's* sake, with whom the Covenant of Grace was for himself, and all his true Spiritual Seed. And 'tis from this Argument the Apostle argues for the calling of the Jews, and the grafting of them in again, who belong to the Election of Grace; they therefore who would make every believing Parent to be the Root to his Natural Off-spring, as *Abraham* was to his true Spiritual Seed or Off-spring, or a common Head or Root of their Natural Off-spring, as he was to his, know not what they say or affirm; for then there would be so many common Roots and Fathers, like as *Abraham* was called a Root and Father; and then also there would be a Knowledge still of Men after the Flesh, which the Apostle *Paul* disclaims, 2 Cor. 5. 17. Moreover, the Jews who were broken off, are still the Natural Seed of *Abraham*; and if therefore this Holiness was an External Relative, Federal Holiness, they are in that sense holy as much as any Children of a believing Gentile can be said to be; but this, 'tis evi-

dent, is not that Holiness of which the Apostle speaks, nor is there any such Holiness under the Gospel-Dispensation spoken of.

Thus, Reader, I have examined Mr. *Owen's* Exposition of this Text, and have found it to be a false Exposition, and a palpable Abuse of the sacred Text, and have opened the Text, I hope, truly. It therefore follows from what I have said in Opposition to what Mr. *Owen* saith in the Close of the ninth Chapter, as here followeth.

1. That by the Natural Branches that receive Virtue and Fatness from the Root before Christ came, were not meant the Natural Seed of *Abraham*, as such, because no ungodly Person did, or doth, or can receive the Virtue and Fatness of the true Olive-Tree, or saving Blessings of the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*. What Virtue or Fatness is in a simple, external, federal Profession or Holiness, either in the Jewish or Christian Religion, as it respects only a Separation to visible Church-Membership?

2. It appears also that the Jews that believed in Christ, tho they were not broken off of the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*, yet they and their Children stood no longer in that Legal and External Covenant of Peculiarity which God made with *Abraham* and the whole House of *Israel*, but that that old Covenant is dissolved.

3. That those Jews that believed not, and their Children, are broken off from being any more in any Covenant-Relation to God as his People, and that for their Unbelief.

4. It also appears that none of the Gentiles are received or grafted into Christ, and into the true Olive, or into the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*, but only such that believe; not them and their Fleshly Seed, as such, but they themselves and their Children also that do believe, even none but such who by Faith partake of the Fatness; that is, the best of Blessings that appertains to the Covenant of Grace, not external Blessings and Privileges only: no, no; they are not the Fatness, *i. e.* the best and the choicest of Covenant-Blessings, but Union with Christ, Justification, Pardon of Sin, Adoption and Eternal

nal Life ; in these things consists the Fatness of the true Olive, which Believers Seed, as such, partake not of, nor any but the Elect and called ones of God, according to his Eternal Purpose only.

5. It also appears, that those Jews that shall be called and grafted in again into their own Olive-Tree, shall be none but the Elect, and that their own Olive-Tree doth not refer to the external Privileges of the Covenant of Peculiarity God made with *Abraham's* Natural Seed, as such, but shall receive of the Fatness of their own Olive-Tree, which is the Covenant of Grace ; for that primarily was made with *Abraham's* Natural Seed, that believe, and belongs to all God's Elect also as their own and proper Olive, whether Jews or Gentiles. So that when the Jews are called, we may be sure they will plead no external Privileges of their old dissolved Covenant, but come in upon the Terms of the Gospel, with their Children that believe and none else : And if the Controversy of Infants right to Baptism and Church-Membership ceaseth not till they shall be called and come in, who will then renounce the old Federal Right, and all Old Testament external Privileges, be sure it will cease then.

C H A P. XII.

In Answer to Mr. Owen's 10th Chapter and 7th Argument, viz. that the Infants of the Faithful, as such, ought to be baptized, because they can partake of those things prefigured in Baptism.

TAKE Mr. Owen's 7th Argument which runs thus, viz.
 " If the Children of the Faithful can partake of the
 " Blessings figured in Baptism, they ought to be Partakers
 " of Baptism also ; if the invisible Grace belongeth unto
 " them, the visible Sign cannot be denied unto them, &c.

Ans. If we should grant that the Children of the Faithful, as such, can and do partake of the Blessings figured in Baptism ; yet it doth not follow they ought to be baptized,

because there is no Precept or Example for it in the New Testament.

For may not I argue thus, *viz.* If the Children of the Faithful can partake of the Blessing prefigured in the Lord's Supper, they ought to partake of the Lord's Supper; if the invisible Grace belongs to them, the visible Sign cannot be denied unto them? This Argument is therefore as forcible to bring our Children to the Lord's Table as it is to Baptism.

" Baptism signifies three things, which (you say) little Children can partake of.

1st. (You say) it signifies Remission of Sins through the Virtue of the Blood of Christ, *Mark* 1. 4. *Acts* 2. 3, 8.

This you say belongs to little Children in two manner of ways.

" 1. They have need of pardoning Grace.

" 2. Many of them receive Remission of Sin, for many of them that die go to Heaven.

Ans. 1. Your first Argument hath as much in it for the baptizing of Infidels and their Children, as for the Children of Believers, for do not they need pardoning Grace?

2. As to your second Reason, Do all the Children of Believers that die go to Heaven? and do none of the Children of Unbelievers go thither? Dare you affirm, that all Unbelievers Children that die are damned? if not, why may they not be baptized as well as the Children of Believers.

3. But do you baptize no Children of Believers but such that die? do not many of them live and prove ungodly when grown up, that you baptize?

Two things you must prove, if you say any thing here to the purpose.

1. That all dying Infants of Believers are elected, and so shall be saved.

2. That all they that go to Heaven, or shall be saved, may, nay ought to have both Baptism and the Lord's Supper administered to them: Nay, and it follows also, that you ought only to baptize those Children of Believers that died, or such that you have ground to believe are elected to Salvation, according to your own Argument. But let me tell you, if you knew what Children of Believers or Unbelievers are elected, yet you ought no more to baptize them,

them, than to give the Lord's-Supper. 'Tis not Election, I tell you again, that gives any a right to Baptism, but the positive Command of Christ: Might not *Melchisedec* or *Job* have said, our Child en do need what was prefigured in Circumcision, therefore we will circumcise them? would that have justified them if they had presumed to have done it without God's Command? for the Command and meer positive Precept to circumcise was only given to *Abraham*, and it only extended to himself, and his Male Children, or such that were in his House or Family, or bought with his Money.

'Therefore all this arguing of yours is weak and groundless.

In vain therefore is that which you say to sinful Parents, that delivered Corruption to their Children, that they should administer Medicines unto them, and so give them the Ordinance of Baptism, which Christ hath appointed for that end, that they might not fall into the bottomless Pit.

Ans. 1. You must prove Christ hath appointed Baptism for Children, do that and your Work is done.

2. Prove that Baptism is the Medicine to cure the Disease of Original Sin, and to save Children (or Adult Persons either) from falling into the bottomless Pit.

You seem to frighten Parents into the Belief of your Tradition: Can any thing save either young or old from Hell, but the Blood and Merits of Christ through the Sanctification of the Spirit? which Baptism can be but a Figure of, ('tis not the Medicine) nor is it appointed to any to be a Figure of that, &c. but to Believers only, who certainly have the things signified.

" 2dly. Baptism (you say) signifies the pouring forth of the Holy Ghost, *Acts* 2. 38. *Tit.* 3. 5. and 'tis certain that little Children can receive the Holy Ghost from their Mothers Womb, *Luke* 1. 15.

Ans. We deny that Baptism signifies the pouring of the Holy Spirit, the Scriptures you cite prove no such thing. It signifies, as I have shewed, the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, with our Death unto Sin, or Mortification of Sin, and rising again to a new Life.

What tho the Promise is made to Christ and his Seed in *Iſa.* 44. 3. & 59. 11. Are Infants of Believers, as ſuch, the Seed of Chriſt, and in the Covenant of Grace?

The Promise of pouring forth of the Spirit is only made to Believers, and to ſuch of their Seed that believe, or to all the Elect of God: Prove that Infants of Believers, as ſuch, in the Goſpel-days received the Holy Spirit; God can, 'tis true, give his Spirit to a Babe in the Womb, and may be to one or two Babes he might do it; ſo he once alſo opened the Mouth of an *Aſs*, muſt all *Aſſes* therefore ſpeak with Man's Voice? You ſay,

“ 3dly. Baptiſm ſignifies Regeneration; and 'tis poſſible
“ (ſay you) that Children may be regenerated: What can
“ hinder the unſpeakable Grace of God's working upon
“ their Hearts? *Jeremiah* was ſanctified in his Mother's
“ Womb.

Anſw. I anſwer, *Pagans* and *Infidels* may be regenerated 'tis poſſible, what can hinder God's working upon their Hearts? Nay; and 'tis probable too God will do it when he affords the Goſpel to them, and when they are regenerated let them be baptized; when they have the thing ſignified, let them have the Sign alſo.

Mr. Baxter ſaith, Baptiſm is a ſign of preſent, not future Regeneration; Baptiſm was not appointed of Chriſt to be a Sign of that which might, or might not be in the true Subject of it hereafter, but of that Regeneration that was certainly wrought in the Perſon before baptized: *If thou believeſt* (if thou haſt true Faith, or art a converted Man) *thou mayſt*, *Acts* 8. not if that hereafter thou mayſt be a Believer, but if thou art now one that doſt believe.

“ (You ſay) God can eaſily give holy Qualities to the
“ Souls of Children: Cannot God reſtore his own Image
“ to little Children? I do not ſay, all the Children of the
“ Faithful receive the Grace of Regeneration in their In-
“ fancy, it is evident to the contrary, many of them be-
“ ing wicked; but on the other hand, the Work of
“ Grace appeareth very early day by day in others of
“ them.

Anſw. If this be ſo, your Cauſe is gone: How? Are not all the Infants of Believers regenerated, and in Covenant with God? Why then do you baptize all, even ſuch that have not the thing ſignified when baptized, nor ever after
till

till they die? *Worthy Britains!* see here Mr. *Owen* does acknowledg that the Infants of Believers, as such, are not in Covenant, for all that are in the Covenant of Grace and have a right to the Seal of it are regenerated; alas, what is the Seal but a Seal of Regeneration, and so of eternal Salvation! *Ephes. 1. 13, 14. Chap. 4. 30.*

“ But (you say) In others Regeneration appears very early, day by day, that is in some little Children.

Ans. 2. But are not some Children of ungodly Parents as early wrought upon and born again as the Children of the godly, why then may not their Children also be baptized? You say Mr. *Eliot* in his Book called, *Tears of Repentance*, speaks of two *Indian* Children who were converted before three Years old: Sir, these were not the Children of Godly Parents.

3. Admit that to be true, and that God sometimes doth regenerate Children at three or four Years of Age.

Such Children I can baptize by the Authority of Christ's Commission, or by Virtue of his holy Precept, and none but such Children that do believe have any right thereunto. *You say Solomon was very young when the Lord loved him.*

Ans. No doubt but the Lord loved his Elect before they were born, *even from Everlasting*, but what of this? yet when they are called and regenerated, and not till then, they ought to be baptized.

In a word, that which renders Persons capable of Baptism are the Prerequisites of Baptism, or those things that are required by Christ to be in the true Subjects thereof, which are Faith and the Profession of it, or Faith and Repentance. You may be capable of being made a Justice of Peace, but you must not exercise that Office without a lawful Commission: So let our Children be capable of what they will or may, yet without a Warrant from God's Word they ought not to be admitted to Baptism, the Lord's Supper, nor to any other Gospel-Ordinance.

God can give sacred Habits and Qualities to a Child we deny not, but till he doth it you are not to give them the Signs of those gracious Qualities; and if there be no visible Signs or Demonstrations of those sacred Qualities in such Infants you baptize that render them Believers, 'tis at best but a mock Baptism.

" Object. If we knew that little Children are regenerated, we would baptize them. This is your Objection against your self, as if we argued thus.

A sw. No, Sir, you mistake us; if we did know little Infants were regenerated, which is impossible for us to know (tho I doubt not but that those Infants that go to Heaven are made holy in some secret way unknown to us, because no unclean thing can enter into Heaven) yet we durst not baptize them, because we want Authority to do it.

But to come to your Answer.

" That (say you) cannot be certainly known of the Adult, therefore by this Objection none can be baptized. 'Tis sufficient in this case, that the Promise of God belongs to the Infant-Seed of the Faithful: They are Members of the visible Church through which the Line of God's Election runneth, Rom. 9. 4, 5. & Chap. 11. 7.

Answer. 1. I answer, tho we cannot, as the Apostles could nor, certainly or infallibly know who were truly regenerated, or are true Believers, yet they baptized none but such in whom they saw such Signs of Grace, that made them in Charity to believe, or hope they were Believers; they made a Profession and Confession of their Faith: but in little Babes there appear no Signs of Grace, nor can they make any Confession of their Faith; where there is no Knowledge, there can be no Faith.

2. And whereas you say they are Members of the visible Church under the Gospel, it is false, the Gospel-Church doth not consist of whole Nations and Families, as did the Jewish Church under the Law in a natural way. The Gospel Church is a Spiritual House, not consisting of Babes in a way of Generation, but of Spiritual Babes in a way of Regeneration, 1 Pet. 2. 5, 6.

3. Nor doth the Promise run to any but to them whom the Lord shall call, Acts 2. 39. even to Jews and their Offspring that are called, and so to the Gentiles that sometimes were afar off; Ephes. 2.

4. As touching Election, 'tis strange to me that you should affirm, that that runneth in the Fleshly Line of Believers and their Seed, as such, and cite that Text to prove it, Rom. 9. 4, 5. in which St. Paul proves directly the contrary, i. e. Not as tho the Word of God hath taken none Effect;

for

for they are not all Israel that are of Israel; ver. 6. Neither because they are the Seed of Abraham are they Children: but in Isaac shall thy Seed be called; ver. 7. That is, they which are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God: but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed; ver. 8.

Sir, tho the Covenants and Promises did belong to the Israelites, yet you may see how the Apostle doth explain it, even to none but to the Elect, or only to such that God by his Spirit, through the Power and Virtue of the Promise, should regenerate and call by his Grace.

Therefore in Opposition to what you say, none were accounted Abraham's Seed and Children of the Promise, but such that were in Christ, Gal. 3. ult.

“(You say) all the Children of the Faithful are under the Promise, but God administred the Grace of the Promise to the Elect only, and to many of them in their Infancy. But because we know not upon whom the Election falleth, it is the Will of God that we should baptize all that are under the Promise.

Ans. 1. If all the Children of the Faithful are under the Promise, they are all elected, because the Promise, to whomsoever 'tis made, is sure to all the Seed; see Rom. 4. 16. If it be the natural Seed, as such, 'tis sure to all them, and not one of the Seed of Believers shall perish; but if it be meant only of the true spiritual Seed, then 'tis sure only to them; for those to whom the Promise is made 'tis confirmed unto by the Word and Oath of God, that so the Heirs of the Promise might have strong Consolation; Heb. 6. 18. Therefore those to whom the Promise belongs, the Grace therefore or Blessing of that Promise God will bestow upon, or else his Promise is made void and of none Effect. Prove that there are any who are under the Promise, or are Children of the Promise, and yet God doth not administer the Grace of the Promise unto them; are any the Children of the Promise and not elected?

2. But whereas you say the Grace of the Promise is given to some in Infancy, we deny it, except to such that die in Infancy; and do you disprove us if you can. But,

3. The worst of all comes at last. Sir, where is it written what you so boldly affirm, viz. *Because you know not upon whom*

whom the Election falleth, it is the Will of God that you should baptize all that are under the Promise? And you affirm that all the Children of Believers are under the Promise. I argue thus, If it be God's Will that all the Children of the Faithful should be baptized, it is revealed in his Word; but this is not revealed in his Word, no nor that any one of them whilst Infants ought to be baptized, therefore 'tis not his Will they should.

4. May not we by your Argument baptize Unbelievers in whom no Grace appears, because we do not know how the Election runs? they may be under the Promise and in the Election as far as we know. What a preposterous way of arguing is this of yours? But no more to your 10th Chapter, and 7th Argument for your Childrens Baptism.

C H A P X I I I .

In Answer to Mr. James Owen's 11th Chapter and 8th Argument, concerning those Baptisms that were under the Law; proving that Christ's Ordinance of Baptism is a pure Gospel-Institution, and that it was not in being till he appointed it in the Gospel-days.

SIR, what you have said in your 11th Chapter, which contains your 8th Argument, tho it may seem new to some, I shall shew it is nothing at all to the purpose.

" You say, the Form of Baptism was before the Law,
" and under the Law; and from thence infer that Chil-
" dren ought to be baptized under the Gospel.

Ans. 1. You may infer from the same Ground and Argument, that Clothes, Pots, Tables and Vessels ought to be baptized under the Gospel, as an Ordinance of Christ, because they were dipped, washed or baptized before and under the Law.

2. More-

2. Moreover, you may infer as well that Unbelievers, yea the worst of Men and Cattle also, ought to be baptized under the Gospel, because *Noah* and his Children were baptized in the Ark, among which was cursed *Cham*: you intimate that *Cham* was baptized upon his Father's Faith; so that it appears the Father's Faith will not only save the Infant-Seed of Believers, but save them when they are Adult Persons also.

But were not the Beasts and the Fowls baptized and saved by the Ark as well as *Noah* and his Children, and his Son *Cham*? But as touching that Text 1 Pet. 3. 10. how the Ark of *Noah* might be a Figure of Baptism, I shall speak to that more fully by and by.

3. Because all sorts of Washings or Dippings are in the Greek Tongue Baptizing, doth it therefore follow that all sorts of Baptisms, Dippings, or Washings, are formally Christ's Ordinance of Baptism?

Mr. *Burkitt*, a great *Pedo-baptist*, and all other learned Men, assert, that to the true Form and Requisites of Gospel-Baptism these several things are necessary.

1. *The Person baptizing, or the Administrator ought to be a lawful Minister, one authorized and commissioned by Christ so to do.*

2. *The Party baptized must be a Subject fitly qualified for Baptism.*

3. *The Element in which the Party is baptized must be Water.*

4. *True Gospel-Baptism must be administered in the Name, or into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*

Now, Sir, was there any Person either young or old, before the Law or under the Law, thus baptized?

“(You say) that *Jacob* received little Children into God's Covenant by Baptism, because he said unto his Household, Put away the strange Gods that are among you, and be ye clean, and change your Garments? Gen. 35. 2.

Ans. 1. Was this Command given to his little Children, or had they corrupted themselves with Idolatry, or by worshipping strange Gods, or who did he appoint to baptize his Babes?

2. What

2. What tho the Hebrew word signifies cleansing or washing with Water, was it therefore formally the Ordinance of Baptism? Did ever any Man argue after this manner before? 'tis a sign you want Proofs for your Childish Baptism in the New Testament that you go to *Genesis* for it, and to such a remote Text that includes nothing of the Controversy.

" But (you say) Circumcision was abominable in the
 " sight of the Gentiles, because the Children of *Ja-*
 " *cob* made it to be an Ordinance of Mortality unto
 " the *Sichemites*, *Gen.* 34. and the greatest part of
 " *Jacob's* Household were Gentiles, therefore *Jacob* re-
 " ceived their Wives and Children into God's Cove-
 " nant through washing of Water, or Baptism; and ac-
 " cording to the Example of *Jacob* they used to baptize
 " all the Gentiles that received Circumcision; for their
 " wise Men spake thus. *None are Profelytes until circum-*
 " *cised and baptized.* *Light.* vol. 1. p. 210. And they
 " baptized the Children with the Parents; little ones are
 " to be baptized according to the Ordinance of the Counsel.
 " *Main. in Light.*

Ans. 1. If this be so, that the Baptism of Children was among the Jews, or in the Jewish Church from the beginning, why do you plead for Baptism to come in the room of Circumcision? it appears your Infant-Baptism is near or altogether as old as Circumcision it self, therefore it could not come in the room of that.

2. I have read, I must confess, in some Authors, that the Jews did receive their Profelytes both by Circumcision and Baptism; but you seem to intimate that *old Jacob* was so wise to dismiss Circumcision to his Gentile Profelytes, (because *Simon* and *Levi* made it so odious) and did contrive or institute Baptism in its room, as the only Rite to receive them into God's Covenant. I must confess *Jacob* had many Failings, but I never heard him thus charged, and rendered guilty of such an Abomination before.

How, Sir! could he lay aside God's holy Ordinance of Circumcision at his Will and Pleasure, and that too because his Sons had brought a Reproach upon it; and did he devise a new Ordinance, namely Baptism, in its room? What an abominable Innovation had he been guilty of should

should he have done this thing, which you seem positively to affirm?

3. Nay, and this is not the worst of *Jacob's* Sins neither; for it appears by your plain words, that you suppose that the Jews from this Example of *Jacob*, used to baptize all the Gentiles that received Circumcision, tho' it appears the Jews did not follow the Example of *Jacob* in throwing Circumcision away, and exchange it for Baptism, yet by *Jacob's* Example did baptize all their Gentile Profelytes, whether Men, Women and Children; so that he caused them to set up, or add a Tradition of his own devising to God's Institution: For I challenge you or any Man under Heaven, to prove that God commanded *Jacob* or any Patriarch, or Jewish Rabbies, to baptize any Profelyte either young or old when received into their Church.

4. Behold, you *Pedo-baptists*, the Rise and Foundation of your Infant-Baptism according to Mr. *Owen's* Conceit! Why? where have we it, even in *Noah's* Ark, wherein the whole World were baptized! For let me thus argue, If all the World in *Noah's* Ark both rational and irrational Creatures were baptized, then Infants may be baptized, nay and all Unbelievers, and Cattel also; but the former is true, *Ergo*. But if we have not the Rise of it here, we have in *Gen. 35. 2. Then said Jacob unto his Household, and unto all that were with him, Put away the strange Gods that are among you, and be you clean, and change your Garments.*

5. Now from *Jacob's* bidding them to be clean, Mr. *Owen* infers, he commands them all to be baptized (but without any Authority or Command of God) even all his Household, Jews and Gentiles, Men, Women and Children, Believers and Unbelievers.

Pray take the Consequence or Inference from hence (it is better perhaps to prove Infant-Baptism, than from those whole Households said to be baptized in the New Testament.)

Jacob commanded all his Household, and all that were with him to be baptized, among which were Gentiles and their Children, therefore we Gentiles and our Children may be baptized. Yea, and our Men-Servants and Maid-Servants, tho' they be *Negro's*, whether they believe or not; for *Jacob* perhaps had some gross Idolaters in his Household, therefore

fore the worst of Men as well as little Children may be baptized.

Honoured Britains! you have seen but little of this Controversy in your Language: But Mr. *Owen*, seeing the old Arguments which the Asserters of Infant-Baptism have brought, to be too weak to establish it to be of God, and from Heaven, out of the New Testament; he hath found out new ones never heard of by me before, I mean this of *Jacob's* commanding his whole Household, and all that were with him, to be clean, that is, saith he, to be baptized all of them. So that Infant-Baptism hath its Rise not from the Command of Christ, but from the Command of *Jacob*, and that not from Circumcision, for *Jacob* laid that aside because his two Sons had caused Circumcision to be odious and hateful to the Gentiles, he therefore contrived Baptism in its stead. O when will this Man cease to pervert the holy and righteous way of God in his Institution of Believers Baptism!

6. I find also that Mr. *James Owen* hath found out the first Rise or Original of that human Tradition of the Jews in baptizing their Gentile Proselytes, both Men, Women and Children. But I am very sorry it is fathered upon holy *Jacob*

Mr. *Burkitt* I must confess makes that Custom that was among the Jews a grand Argument for Infant-Baptism; and as if the New Testament without the Old was not a sufficient Rule for the Practice of Gospel-Baptism, but that we must have recourse to the Old Testament as well as the New.

To which I answer; That tho in some Points of Faith and Practice the Old Testament and the New together is the Rule by which we ought to walk, yet his Trumpet and yours in this case gives an uncertain Sound: For in respect of Practice, were there not many Laws and Precepts given to the People of the Jews, which no ways in the least concerns us or God's Spiritual Israel under the Gospel? If you explain your self no better, you may soon subvert the People, and carry them away to *Judaism* with a witness; nay and instead of baptizing Children upon such a Childish and Erroneous foot of Account, make them think they ought to circumcise them, as some of late here in *England* were deluded to do. Therefore

we say, as to all Precepts of the Gospel that are meer positive Laws, the New Testament is our only Rule without the Old. Christ alone is our Law-giver, and him and not *Moses* we are only to hear and hearken unto; tho as to matter of Faith the Old Testament may be useful to us in many respects, and also all Precepts that are purely Moral in their own Nature; The Old Testament is a Rule to us as well as the New, which I might shew in many respects, not only touching the Law of the Decalogue, but also about days of Prayer, singing God's Praises, Fasting-days, &c. But for any to intimate in the Case of Baptism, that the Old Testament is a Rule of Practice, or in respect of Jewish Church-Membership, such strangely betray their Ignorance, as will further appear hereafter. For that Circumcision was a meer Legal or Jewish Rite, I shall evidently anon fully prove.

You and Mr. *Barkitt*, with other Pedo-baptists, affirm, that so little is said in the New Testament about baptizing Infants, because the Custom of baptizing them was common, and the Practice constant in the Jewish Church, at and before our Saviour's time. Whilst Circumcision was the covenanting Sign, Baptism was the purifying Ceremony among the Jews; for when any of the Gentiles were admitted into the Jewish Church, both Parents and Children were first circumcised, and then washed in token of cleansing them from the Filth of their Heathenism: So that Baptism among the Jews constantly went along with Circumcision till our Saviour's time.

Ans. 'Tis a sign of a bad Cause when Men are forced to try their Wits after such a ridiculous manner to make out what they have to prove. Pray, was that Custom among the Jews of baptizing Infants, when any of the Gentiles were admitted into the Jewish Church, commanded of God? Had God given the Jews any such Law or Precept? Or was it one of their own Traditions, who in their own Wisdom, without any Warrant from their great Prophet and Law-giver, devised that Ceremony, possibly to wash away the Filth of Heathenism, as your Predecessors in like manner, without any Command or Warrant of Jesus Christ, devised the baptizing of Infants,

to wash away the Filth of Original Sin? Doth not our blessed Saviour say that *they had made void the Commandments of God through their Traditions*? I do affirm, it was never given them as a Law or Precept by the great God, nor do you attempt once to prove any such thing; for there is not the least shadow of any such thing in all the Old Testament; therefore it was a meer Human Tradition.

2. Can any wise Man who would do nothing in God's Service without a sufficient Rule or Warrant from the Word of God, think this a good Argument for Infant Baptism? I must tell you (as I have already told the *Athenian Society*, with whom I had to do in this matter) that a Popish Tradition is every way as good as a Jewish one. You were better plead thus, the *Romish Church*, without any Warrant from God's Word, received Infant-Baptism as an unwritten Apostolical Tradition, and in some Councils early: *Quicumq; parvulos recens ab uteris Matrum baptizandos esse negat, Anathema esto.* Milev. Can. 2. and anathematized or cursed all who should deny that new-born Infants were to be baptized, therefore we may baptize Infants. Why do you fly to the fabulous and idle Traditions of the Jewish Rabbins for your Childish Baptism, since you have the Testimony of so many Romish Doctors and General Councils, who positively affirm you ought to baptize your children? Sure the Authority of the latter is as good as the former.

3. But is it so indeed, did our Saviour say nothing of Infant Baptism? or, as you hint, leave so little of it in the New Testament, because it was the constant Custom among the Jews to baptize the Children of Heathens before they admitted them into their Church? What Dr. *Hammond*, *Taylor*, and *Lightfoot* have said upon that account, is to their shame and Reproach rather than to their Honour, tho I know it was their last Refuge, when they saw your Scripture-Proofs would not prove it to be a Truth of Christ. O how are we beholden to the Jewish Talmud and Jewish Rabbins for our Infant-Baptism! Nay, which is worst of all, how is Christ beholden to them for that rare Invention, who had said so much for it, and made it so common a Practice among them, that it saved him the Pains to give the least Directions about it?

But is not this next to Blasphemy? Can any Man in his right Wits think our Lord Jesus should confirm a Tradition and Innovation of the Jews? Or take his great Ordinance of Baptism from the Superstitious, Fabulous and Erroneous Custom of their Doctors and Rabbins? Besides, was Baptism to be preached or practised by none but the Jewish People? Doth it not belong to the Gentiles too? Did not our Saviour command his Disciples to go into all Nations, and make Disciples, and baptize them? &c. Was it in his Mind that Infants should be baptized, and yet say nothing of it, because it was a common Custom and Practice among the Jews? But, pray, what must the Gentiles do to know this to be their Duty? (I mean those Gentiles who received the Christian Faith) viz. that they ought to baptize their Children who did not know, nor ever heard of that Jewish Custom? Or dare you say our New Testament is not authentick, or sufficient to teach us the whole of Gospel-Duties, and Obedience, without the Jewish *Talmud*? You should not (tis plain) only have said the New Testament is not without the Old the Rule of our practice; but also that the New Testament, and the Old, without the Jewish *Talmud*, is not sufficient, and then you had done your Business at once. Why are not Men ashamed thus to go about to blind and deceive the poor People?

Is not the whole Mind of Jesus Christ, even all his Laws and Precepts, or his whole Counsel, plainly contained in his Blessed Word? But would you have People be wise above what is written, and teach Men to reflect upon the Care and Faithfulness of the Blessed Jesus, in leaving out of the Sacred Bible one great Truth of God, and leave us to find it out by going to search the Jewish Tradition?

4. If it was a Custom among the Jews, it must be a Sacred Custom, I mean a Custom that God appointed and commanded them to observe, or else a Human Tradition or vain Custom: And if it had been a Mosaical Rite, given by God himself to the Jews, Christ then be sure abolished it, and nailed it to his Cross, with all its Fellows, and 'tis gone for ever, since he hath not given it out a-new.

Take this Argument,
That Custom among the Jews, that God never commanded, nor is any where given by *Moses* unto them, who was
M faith-

faithful in all his House, was no Ordinance of God, but a meer Human Tradition: But the Custom of baptizing the Heathen and their Children, who were admitted into their Church, was never commanded of God, nor any where given unto them by *Moses*, who was faithful in all his House.

Ergo, That Custom was no Ordinance of God, but a meer Human Tradition.

Lastly, Take what a VVorthy and Learned Author hath said in Confutation of this foolish and absurd Argument for Pedit-baptism, 'tis Sir Norton Knatchbull, Kt. and Baronet. " The Thing, saith he, is uncertain, that it cannot be said
" of the Rabbins, that there were not several among them
" who differed very much about this matter; for Rabbi
" *Eliezar* expressly contradicts Rabbi *Joshua*, who was the
" first that I know of who asserted this sort of Baptism a-
" mong the Jews; for Rabbi *Eliezar* who was Contempo-
" rary with Rabbi *Joshua*, if he did not live before him,
" asserts that a Profelyte Circumcised, and not Baptized,
" was a true Profelyte: for so we read of the Patriarchs,
" *Abraham*, *Isaac* and *Jacob*, that they were Circumcised,
" but not Baptized. But Rabbi *Joshua* affirms, that he
" who was Baptized, not he that was Circumcised, was a
" true Profelyte. To whom shall I give Credit, to *Eliezar*
" who asserts what the Scripture confirms, or to *Joshua*
" who asserts what is no where to be found in Scripture?
" But the Rabbins upheld *Joshua's* Side, and what Wonder
" was it? For it made for their Business; that is, for the
" Honour of the Jewish Religion, that the Christians
" should borrow their Ceremonies from them. But
" when I see Men of great Learning in these Times fetching
" the Foundations of Truth from the Rabbins, I cannot
" but hesitate a little: For whence was the *Talmud* sent, as
" they are the Words of *Buxtorf*, in his *Synagoga Judaica*,
" that we should give Credit thereto, that from thence we
" should believe that the Law of *Moses* either can or ought
" to be understood? Much less the Gospel, to which they
" were profess'd Enemies. For the *Talmud* is called a La-
" byrinth of Errors, and the Foundation of Jewish Fables;
" it was brought to Perfection, and held for authentick
" five hundred Years after Christ: Therefore it is unrea-
" sonable

" sonable to rest upon the Testimony of it. And that
 " which moves me most, *Josephus* (to omit all the Fathers
 " that lived before the *Talmud* was finished) who was a
 " Jew, and a Contemporary with Rabbi *Eliezar*, who also
 " wrote in particular of the Rites, Customs and Acts of
 " the Jews, is altogether silent in this Matter. So that it
 " is an Argument to me, next to a Demonstration, that
 " two such Eminent Persons, both Jews, and living at the
 " same Time, the one should positively deny, and the
 " other make no mention of Baptism among the Jews.
 " Besides, if Baptism, in the Modern Sense, were in
 " use among the Jews in Antient Times, why did the Pha-
 " risees ask *John Baptist*, *why dost thou baptize if thou art*
 " *not Christ, nor Elias, nor that Prophet?* Do they not
 " plainly intimate that Baptism was not in use before, and
 " that it was a received Opinion among them, that there
 " should be no Baptism till either Christ, or *Elias*, or
 " that Prophet came? So far Sir Norton Knatchbull, in his
 Notes printed at Oxford, Anno Dom. 1677. with the Licence
 of the Vice-Chancellor, a very Learned Man, and a Son of
 the Church of England. Sir, What think you now of
 your Jewish Custom of baptizing the Heathens, and their
 Children, who were admitted to their Church? Do you
 think there was nor need that Infant-Baptism should be
 mentioned in the Holy Scripture, had it been a Truth?
 Is this uncertain Story of the Jewish Custom sufficient for
 you to build your Faith and Practice upon, when the
 Truth of the Story, as to Matter of Fact, may justly be
 doubted? But if it was true, it is but a rotten Founda-
 tion to build one of the great Sacraments of Christ up-
 on, viz. a vile, profane and Human Tradition of the Jew-
 ish Rabbins.

" You say, The *Israelites* and their Children were bap-
 " tized in the Cloud, and in the Sea, 1 Cor. 10. 2, 3.
 " That *Israel* going under the Cloud, and through the
 " Sea; that was, say you, a Baptism unto them: The
 " Cloud rained upon them, and the Sea dropped upon
 " them, which was as a High Wall round about them.
 " 2. This Baptism under the Cloud, and in the Sea,
 " signifyeth, in its Essence, the same thing with the Bap-
 " tism of the Gospel, viz. the Lord Jesus Christ and his
 " Bless-

“ Blessings : The Spiritual Washings in the Sea, and
 “ the Spiritual Drink from the Rock, signified the
 “ same thing; even Christ he was the Substance of
 “ all the Types under the Law. The Pillar of Cloud,
 “ and the Pillar of Fire, did foreshew the Baptism of
 “ Water, and the Baptism of Fire, or of the Holy Spirit;
 “ the falling of the Water from the Cloud, signified the
 “ pouring of the Holy Ghost, &c.

“ 3. The Children were baptized with their Parents,
 “ with the Baptism of *Moses*, they were all baptized unto
 “ *Moses*, &c.

Answer. Two Things are to be done to disprove what
 you say here.

1. That the Rain falling from the Cloud, was not that
 which was the Figure of Baptism.

2. That this Text doth not prove Infants to be the Sub-
 jects of Baptism.

First, If Persons may be said to be baptized when it
 rains upon them, How many times have you and I been so
 baptized? Besides, Do you think it never rained upon the
Israelites before they passed through the Sea?

And *Secondly*, Prove if you can it did then either rain
 upon them from the Cloud, or that the Sea dropped upon
 them; 'tis but your own ungrounded Supposition.

Thirdly, Prove that Rain falling upon them, can in any
 Sense be called a Washing or Baptism.

Therefore let the Reader consider well what our Anno-
 tators speak on this Place; see Mr. *Pool's Annotations* on
 1 Cor. 10. 2, 3. “ Others, saith he, more probably think
 “ that the Apostle useth this Term, in regard of the great
 “ Analogy betwixt Baptism, (as it was then used) the Per-
 “ sons baptized going down into the Waters, and being
 “ dipped in them, and the *Israelites* going down into the
 “ Sea, that great Receptracle of Water; though the Water
 “ at that time was gathered on Heaps on either side of
 “ them, yet they seemed buried in the Water, as Persons
 “ in that Age were when baptized. Thus spake your Bre-
 thren who compleated Mr. *Pool's Annotations*. They tell
 you in what Sense the Fathers were said to be baptized
 unto *Moses*, in the Sea, and under the Cloud. Here is no-
 thing of sprinkling, pouring, or raining on them; but they
 were,

were, as it were, buried in the Sea, and under the Cloud; and so it represents Immersion or Dipping, which is Christ's true Baptism. We are buried (not sprinkled) with Christ in Baptism, both in the Sign and also in Signification; so shew he was dead, buried, and rose again for us, and that we are dead to Sin and ought to walk in Newness of Life.

But do not mistake, the Fathers being said to be baptized to *Moses* in the Sea, and under the Cloud, was no real, but Typical Baptism.

2. This Place proves not that Infants are the Subjects of Gospel Baptism.

1. 'Tis said all our Fathers were baptized, but 'tis not said their Children were baptized unto *Moses* in the Sea, and under the Cloud.

" 2. But you intimate, there were many Children with them as they passed through the Sea.

To which I answer, so there were many wicked Men also; all the *Israelites* were not godly Persons, but many among them were prophane and ungodly People: Besides, there was a mixt People passed through the Sea with the Fathers also, may be some of the *Egyptians*, and others of other Nations, and much Cattle also; and these were all baptized as truly as were the little Children.

May we baptize such therefore? we have as much ground from hence to baptize such, as you have to baptize your Babes, nay more ground, if the Rain falling upon the *Israelites* was that which baptized them; 'tis a Question whether any Rain might fall on little Babes, if it fell on their Parents, for the Parents might cover them by holding some thing over their Heads and Bodies, &c.

3. The same Persons which the Apostle saith were baptized in the Sea, and under the Cloud, are also said to eat the same Spiritual Meat, and to drink the same Spiritual Drink. Now did not the Children partake of the Lord's Supper, I mean that Typical Lord's Supper? This Text therefore proves as strongly that you may give them the Lord's Supper as Baptism, because they ate of the *Manna* that fell from Heaven, and drank of the Water that came from the Rock.

4. The design of the Apostle here is, to forewarn the Saints at Corinth to take heed lest they fell as the Fathers fell

fell in the Wilderness; and to caution them the more effectually, he shews them that the Fathers who fell (not the Children) in the Wilderness, had like great Privileges with them, viz. a *Typical Baptism*, and also a *Typical Lord's Supper*.

Therefore nothing of this matter concerned their little Babes, nor ours neither. As to what you say of whole Households being baptized in the New Testament in this Chapter, I shall refer my Answer to that Chapter of yours where you particularly insist upon that weak Argument.

" You say, the Parents and their Children were baptized, by giving of the Law upon Mount Sinai, Exodus 19. 10. *Go to the People, and sanctify them, and let them wash their Clothes.* Now the washing of their Clothes and the washing of the Flesh went together, Lev. 15. 5, 6. wash his Clothes, and wash himself in Water. Being thus washed, the Apostle saith, that all the People entered into God's Covenant by Baptism, Heb. 9. 19. *For when Moses had spoken every Precept to the People according to the Law, he took the Blood of Calves and of Goats, with Water, and sprinkled both the Book and the People.* The Apostle calls this Sprinkling, Baptism, Heb. 9. 10. *divers Baptisms, &c.*

Ans. I answer, you have once already to your great Reproach, and I fear contrary to the Light of your own Conscience, asserted that which is false; I appeal to you, and all that can read the Greek, whether that word in Heb. 9. 10. *ἡ διαφόροις βαπτισμοῖς*, *divers washings*, which I deny not may be read *divers Baptisms*, is the same word in Heb. 9. 19. viz. *ἐρραντισ*, *sprinkling the Book and all the People*, is it there *βαπτίζω*, or *ερραντίζω*? Speak and confess your Ignorance, or else acknowledg your Sin in going about to deceive the People, by making them believe that sprinkling is in Greek Baptism or baptizing: For the washing in Heb. 9. 10. is Baptism or baptizing, yet in Heb. 9. 19. Sprinkling both the Book and People, you must needs know is in the Greek rantizing.

2. And what tho these divers washings are called Baptisms, I have shew'd once already from a Faithful and Learned

Learned Author, namely Mr. *Henry Ainsworth*, that all those Legal Washings were by total dipping of the whole Body.

Take his Words again on *Levit. 11. 32.* " All that are unclean, whether Men or Vessels, are not cleansed but by dipping or baptizing in Water; and wheresoever the Law speaketh of washing a Man's Flesh, or washing of Clothes for Uncleanneſs, it is by dipping the whole Body therein: and whether they be Men or Vessels, there may not be any thing between them and the Water, to keep them asunder, as Clay, Pitch, or the like, that cleaveth to the Body or Vessel; if there be, then they are, saith he, unclean, and their washing profiteth them not. *Maim Mikvaoth, chap. 1. § 12, 21.*

Take heed what you affirm for the future: This Man, you and all know, was well acquainted with Jewish Rites and Ceremonies; and what can be a more full Confutation of what you affirm of Jewish Washings or Baptisms? But where we read of sprinkling of Blood and Water, 'tis not baptizing, unless baptizing and rantizing be both one and the same Word, and Thing, which we utterly deny.

3. What tho the People were washed, even all the whole Congregation, Was not that a Typical Church, and did it not typify that all true Believers must be washed in the Blood of Christ in Justification, and also washed by the Holy Spirit in Sanctification? These Things were held forth thereby, and not Baptism. You would make one thing that is a Figure or Shadow, a Type of another thing that is also it self but a Shadow or Figure; for Baptism signifies Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, and our Death unto Sin, and Vivification to a new Life. But those Types were Shadows of good things to come, even of Christ, he was the Substance of them all; they must I say prefigure a Substance, not a Shadow.

4. In a word, all your labour is here lost about those divers Legal Baptisms and Rites under the Old Testament, and of Children being in that Covenant, because they were all Types; even that all the Elect, or all that believe in Christ, should be washed in Christ's Blood, or

have his Blood sprinkled upon them; and be sanctified by his Spirit: Also it was a legal external and Typical Covenant, and an external Typical Church, holding forth the true Spiritual Gospel-Church; and that, like as Circumcision and those divers washings, did belong to the whole House of *Israel*, whether Godly or not.

So all the true *Israel*, under the Gospel Dispensation, should have the Substance and Anti-type of them; and when any have attained to Faith in Christ, and have what is signified in Baptism, then and not till then they ought to be baptized: But this not simply because they are in Covenant, or have the thing signified in Baptism, but because of the express and positive Command of Christ. I say again, nothing can give being to an Ordinance that wholly depends on a meer positive Rite, but the express Will and Command of the Law-giver.

To conclude with this, I infer,

1. From the whole, in Opposition to what Mr. *Owen* saith, it plainly appears that the sprinkling of Water is not Baptism.

2. That God receives all into the Covenant of Grace and Gospel-Church, through the Spiritual washing of Regeneration and Sanctification of the Spirit; and that such only by Christ's positive Command ought to be baptized.

3. That there was no Gospel-Baptism, no Baptism of Christ under the Law, but that 'tis a pure positive Command and Institution of our Lord Jesus in the Gospel.

4. That God received none of his People under the Law into Covenant, through Baptism, or through sprinkling of Water and Blood: And that the sprinkling of Blood was a Figure of the Atonement of Christ's bloody Sacrifice, and the sprinkling of Water of the sanctifying Virtue of the Spirit in Sanctification, and not that Gospel-Baptism was signified thereby.

5. That 'tis only the meer positive Command of Christ in the New Testament, that gives being, and a just Right, to Gospel-Baptism.

6. That tho the Children with their Parents were taken into the Legal or Typical Jewish Church, by God's positive Command, that being a National and Typical Church, yet no Children or Parents are by the positive Command of Christ in the New Testament to be received into the Gospel-Church,

Church, but only those of them that believe and are washed in the Blood of Christ, and sanctified by the Sacred Water of the Holy Ghost; sith the Church of God now is not National, but Congregational, not consisting of the Fleshly, as such, but the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*.

And since there being no Precept nor Precedent in all the New Testament, that any one Infant was baptized or taken into the Gospel-Church, it follows 'tis an Human Tradition.

7. That the Covenant on *Sinai*, and the Ceremonial Law, was not the Covenant of Grace, tho given in subserviency thereunto, and the latter a clear Figure of the Covenant of Grace, and held it forth to all such who by Faith could see beyond those Sacrifices to the Anti-type of them.

Lastly, Mr. *Owen* saith, " If Children were baptized formerly into Covenant, ought they not to be baptized into this Covenant now, especially because the Grace of the Covenant being enlarged under the Dispensation of the Gospel, and the Privileges being more extensive?

I answer, He doth but beg the Question, asserting that which he proves not, nor is ever able to prove, *viz.*

(1.) That Children were baptized into the Covenant under the Law; What *Pedo-baptist* ever asserted this before? And in vain doth he affirm it now, especially since he cannot prove sprinkling is Baptism.

(2.) That all Infants were received into Covenant with God by Legal sprinkling, and not till then; but certainly all the Infants of the Jews were born Members of that National Church, therefore not received into that Church and Covenant by Circumcision (which most of the Assertors of Childrens Baptism do affirm); much less not by sprinkling Blood and Water upon them: Yet that sprinkling of Blood and Water might, I deny not, be a Sign that they, and the whole House of *Israel*, were God's Legal Covenant People; and so the Type of the whole Spiritual *Israel*, who should be washed in the Blood of Christ, or Blood of the New Covenant, and sanctified by his Spirit, as is said before.

2. More

2. Moreover evident it is, that tho the Covenant of Grace, in the Dispensation of it under the Gospel, is enlarged, and the Spiritual Privileges more extensive than were the Privileges of the Legal Covenant and Legal Church; yet the external Privileges are less and not so extensive now as was theirs: How many outward and earthly Privileges had the Jews and Ministers of God under the Law more than the Saints and Ministers of Christ have now? Many of which I have reckoned up in the beginning of this Treatise. Thus I close with your Eighth Argument.

C H A P.

C H A P XIV.

Proving that Children have no Right to Baptism, from John the Baptist's Administration of Baptism; in Opposition to what Mr. James Owen saith, in his 12th Chapter: That John baptized no Infants, neither according to the Practice of the Jewish Church, nor by virtue of any Commission he had from God that sent him. Containing an Answer to Mr. Owen's 9th Argument for Pedo-Baptism.

MR. Owen saith, " If John baptized Infants, Baptism doth always belong unto them; for the Baptism of John and the Baptism of the Apostles were the same in the Substance of it: He baptized in the Name of Christ to come, and they baptized in the Name of Christ that was come.

Ans. If you can prove John baptized Infants, you do your Business indifferent well.

Now say you, " What we are to prove in this Chapter, is, that John baptized Infants; to manifest this, let it be considered,

" 1. John the Baptist came not to nullify the Covenant of Abraham, but rather to fulfil it; and the Covenant of Abraham was, that God would be a God to his People, and to their Seed; all the Visible Church of the Jews were in this Covenant: John warneth them that they trusted not in the Privileges of this Covenant, by living ungodly Lives; he doth not in any Place make void this Covenant, but rather confirms it, saying, God will raise other Children to Abraham, if the Jews brought not forth Fruit meet for Repentance; he came to baptize the Seed of Abraham,

“ *brham*, which were all of them in the Covenant of
 “ God, not only the Parents but the Children also :
 “ Therefore their Children had the same right to Bap-
 “ tism as their Parents had.

Ans. 1. I deny not but the whole House of *Israel* were in Covenant with God, both Parents and Children, and so abode till the old Covenant and old Covenant-Seed were cast out; but *What saith the Scripture?* Cast out the Bond-woman and her Son, Gal. 4. 30. Now the Apostle tells you, by the Bond-woman is meant the *Sinai* Covenant, and by her Son the natural Seed of *Abraham* as such, Gal. 4. 22, 23, 24, 25.

2. This Grant of yours proves that the Jewish Covenant, which took in all the People both Parents and Children, was not the Covenant of Grace; because but a small number of the Jews were in God's Election, and so in the Covenant of Grace.

See Dr. Owen on the *Hebrews*, 3d Vol. Pag. 256.
 “ The Covenant of Grace in Christ is made only with
 “ the *Israel* of God, the Church of the Elect. Pag.
 291. “ The new Covenant is made with all, who effe-
 “ ctively and eventually are made Partakers of it; and if
 “ they are not so with whom the New Covenant is made,
 “ it comes short of the Old in Efficacy, who were actual
 “ Partakers of the benefit of that, that is, of those ex-
 “ ternal Benefits.

3. Nor doth that which you mention help you, viz. that in that Covenant made with *Abraham* and the whole House of *Israel*, 'tis said God would be their God, or a God to *Abraham* and to his Seed in their Generations. For,

First, God may be said to be the God of a People divers manner of ways, as Dr. Bates observes.

“ 1. Upon the account of Creation, thus he is our
 “ God and Father; O Lord thou art our Father, we are
 “ the Clay, and thou art our Potter, and we are all the
 “ works of thy Hands, Isa. 64. 8.

“ 2. Saith he, By external Calling and Profession,
 “ there is an intercurrent Relation of the Father and Son
 “ between God and his People: Thus the Posterity of
 “ *Seth* are called the Sons of God, Gen. 6. and the entire
 “ Nation of the Jews are so called; When *Israel* was
 “ young,

“ young, I called my Son from Egypt, Hos. II. Dr. Bates
in his Sermon on Mr. Baxter's Funeral.

Secondly, God may be said to be the God of a People by way of special Interest, by Election, Regeneration and Adoption; thus he was not a God to the whole House of *Israel*, both to Parents and Children without exception: Yet we grant God was their God by entering into a visible and external Covenant with them; and as so considered he was said to be their God, and an Husband to them. Jer. 31. 32. *which Covenant they broke, altho I was an Husband to them, saith the Lord.* But pray observe, the New Covenant is said not to be according to that Covenant which God made with this People, when he took them by the Hand and brought them out of the Land of Egypt.

Thirdly, Now if that Covenant, in which God is said to be their God, was the Old Covenant, or the Legal Covenant which God hath took away, to establish the *Second*, What doth that signify which you affirm here?

Certainly, *John* would not go about to establish that Covenant which he knew his Master was ready to take away, viz. the Covenant of Peculiarity God made with *Abraham* and his Natural Seed, as such.

We deny not, but the free Promise that God made with *Abraham* is the Covenant of Grace; but that belongs not to Believers Seed, as such: For some of Unbelievers Seed may be in the Covenant of Grace, and some of Believers Seed may not, i. e. the Children of the Promise, or Covenant of Grace, or the Elect of God may lie amongst the Unbelievers Children, as well as amongst Believers Children: Tho I doubt not but more of Believers Seed are called than of others, and have greater Privileges, i. e. by the Instruction, Prayers, and good Example of their Parents, &c.

Fourthly, Tho *John* did not nullify the external Covenant, yet he, being to prepare Christ's way, gave the Jews a clear Intimation of the repealing of it, or the period thereof, and that *now* it would stand them in no stead;

stead; they indeed made this which you say an Argument to come to his Baptism, namely because of that Covenant with *Abraham*, or their being his Children: But what did *John* say? *Think not to say within your selves, we have Abraham to our Father.* As much as if he should say, your being the Seed of believing *Abraham*, according to the Flesh, will give you no Right to Gospel-Baptism nor other Gospel Ordinances and Privileges, tho it gave you right to Circumcision and Legal Privileges.

“ You say, He doth not make void the Covenant
 “ with *Abraham*, but rather confirms it; saying, God could
 “ raise other Children to *Abraham*, if the Jews brought
 “ not forth Fruit meet for Repentance.

Ans. Tho he did not make void that Legal Covenant, yet he explained the nature thereof to the Jews, and shewed them their great Error and Mistake about it, clearly intimating that the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham* and with his Spiritual Seed did differ, and was of another Nature with that Covenant which God made with him and his Natural Seed, as such; (for saith he, *God is able to raise up of these Stones Children to Abraham*, meaning the Gentiles, as Expositors give it) if the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* ran only to his Fleishly Seed, as such, Why did *John* say God could raise up others to be his Children? even such that were not of his Natural Seed. And also, Why did he refuse them, who were his Natural Seed, *That did not bring forth Fruit meet for Repentance*, or did not believe, and so shewed themselves not to be the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*?

Fifthly, From hence therefore it follows, in opposition to what you say, That Gospel-Baptism is not of the same extent with Circumcision.

“ As the whole Countrey, say you, were under Circum-
 “ cision, so doth *John* receive them to his Baptism, he re-
 “ fused none that came to his Baptism, but received
 “ *Publicans, Sadduces, Pharisees, viz. the Generations of*
 “ *Vipers*, Matth. 3. 7, 8. And can it be thought he re-
 “ fused little Children?

Ans.

Ans. I wonder you should affirm that *John* received all the Countrey to his Baptism, and refused none, no not the Generation of Vipers: This I deny, and you have no shadow of Reason to assert it, since he rebuked them when he saw them coming to his Baptism, and bid them bring forth Fruit meet for Repentance. Prove, if you can, that he baptized one Soul but such only that were penitent, and demonstrated the truth of their Repentance by bringing forth of the Fruits thereof.

'Tis very strange to me that any Man should assert that *John* the Baptist (whose Doctrine and Ministry by all Divines is look'd upon to be very severe and sharp) should baptize all, even the worst of Men, yea such whom he called a Viprous Generation. But what is the purport of this Argument of yours for Infant-Baptism? Certainly all may easily see it: Doth it not tend to prove that all ungodly and unbelieving Men and Women are to be baptized as well as Infants?

Let me but justly infer upon you, and from what you say here, after this manner, viz.

If *John* Baptist baptized all that came to him, even all the ungodly Jews, as *Publicans, Sadduces, Pharisees*, yea those Generations of Vipers; then Unbelievers, yea the worst and vilest of Men, are as true Subjects of Baptism as Believers. 'Tis no matter whether they believe or not, repent or not, or at present bring forth Fruit meet for Repentance or not; *John* took their Word, their Promise that they would do those things afterwards.

What Notions do you impose upon your unwary Readers? I thought all Adult Persons (according to the avowed Principle of the *Pedo-baptists*, as well as *Anti-pedobaptists*) must believe, and manifest true Repentance before they ought to be baptized. Reader, see Mr. *Baxter's* Book, *Confirmation and Restoration*, printed 1658. He affirms, viz. "That a personal believing is the Condition of the Title of them at Age, is far past doubt. Pag. 16.

1. Saith he, "The Promise it self doth expressly require Faith of our own, of all the Adult. *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved*, Mark 16. 16. What doth hinder me to be baptized? And Philip said, if thou believest with all thine Heart, thou mayst. These two Scriptures and many more Mr. *Baxter* quotes.

His

His 2d Argument is this, " If a Profession of Faith were
 " not necessary, *coram Ecclesia*, to Mens Church-Membership
 " and Privileges, then Infidels and Heathens would have
 " Right.

His 3d Argument runs thus, *viz.* " It is a granted Case
 " among all Christians, that a Profession is thus necessary ;
 " the Apostles and Antient Church admitted none without
 " it. *Pag. 17, 21.*

Again he says, *Pag. 24.* " We find when *John* Baptist
 " set up his Ministry, he caused the People to confess their
 " Sins. ~~And~~ And whereas some say that *John* baptized them
 " that he calleth a Generation of Vipers; I answer, saith he,
 " we will believe that when they prove it : It seems rather
 " that he put them back, as to those *Acts 2. 37.* Saith he,
 " It is plain that they made an open Profession, if you con-
 " sider,

1. " That they were openly told the Doctrine which
 " they must be baptized into, if they did consent.
2. " It is said they that received the Word were baptized.
3. " It is as certain therefore, that they first testified
 " their glad reception of the Word.
4. " VVe may not imagine that *Peter* was God, or knew
 " the Hearts of those thousands, and therefore he must know
 " it by their Profession, that they gladly received the VVord.
5. " Their own Mouths cry out for advice in order to
 " their Salvation.
6. " It had been absurd for the Apostles to attempt to
 " baptize Men that had not first professed their Consent.
7. " The Scripture (saith he) gives us not the full Histo-
 " rical Narration of all that was said in such Cases, but of
 " so much as was necessary.
8. " The Institution and Nature of the Ordinance tells
 " us, that Baptism could not be administered, without a Pro-
 " fession, to the Adult; for they were to be baptized into
 " the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost: Therefore
 " were to profess that they believed in the Father, Son,
 " and Holy Ghost, &c. *Pag. 25.*
9. " The constant practice of the universal Church, hath
 " given us by infallible Tradition, as full assurance of the
 " order of Baptism, and in particular of an expreis Pro-
 " fession and Covenant then made, as of any Point that by
 " the Hand of the Church can be received. *Pag. 26.*

10. " And

" 10. And it was in those days a more notorious Profession to be so Baptized, and to joyn in the Holy Assemblies then now it is, when the Profession of Christianity did hazard Mens Liberties, Estates and Lives, to be openly then Baptized, upon covenanting with God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, &c. Moreover saith he, it is said of all that were Baptized, (being then at Age) that they first believed, and how could the Baptizers know that they believed, but by their Profession, pag. 26.

" Yea, 'tis said of *Simon Magus*, that he believed, and was baptized, which though he might really have some historical Faith; yet implyeth, that he openly professed more then he indeed had, or else he had scarce been baptized, which hath caused Interpreters to judge, that by Faith, is meant a profession of Faith. And if so, then sure a profession of Faith is still necessary. p. 27.

" Yea (saith he) Christ in his Commission, directeth his Apostles to make Disciples, and then baptize them; promising, that he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved. And who can tell whether a Man be a Disciple, a Believer, or an Infidel, but by his Profession.

" How was it known but by their Profession, that the *Samaritans* believed *Phillip*, preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God and the name of Jesus Christ, before they were baptized, *Acts* 8. 12.

" *Phillip* caused the *Eunuch* to profess, before he would baptize him, that he believed that Jesus Christ was the Son of God, &c.

" *Saul* had more then a bare Profession before baptized, *Acts* 9. 15, 17.

" Also *Cornelius* and his Company had more then a Profession, for they had the Holy Ghost poured on them, speaking with Tongues. And it was such a Gift of the Spirit, that caused the Apostle to conclude, that God had granted the Gentiles Repentance unto Life, *Acts* 11. 8.

" The Converted Gentiles, *Acts* 13. 48. shewed their belief and gladness. p. 27.

" Gods Order is (to the Adult saith he,) first to send Preachers to proclaim the Gospel, and when by that

‘ Men are brought so far as to profess or manifest their
 ‘ Eyes are opened, and that they are turned from dark-
 ‘ ness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God,
 ‘ then they must be baptized for the remission of Sins.

‘ As their Sins are not forgiven them till they are con-
 ‘ verted, *Mark* 4. 12. so they must not be baptized till
 ‘ they profess themselves converted, seeing to the
 ‘ Church, *none esse*, and *none apparere*, is all one;
 ‘ Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our
 ‘ Lord Jesus Christ, is the summ of that preaching
 ‘ that makes Disciples, *Acts* 20. 21. and therefore both
 ‘ these must by profession seem to be received before a-
 ‘ ny at Age are baptized, *p.* 30. 31.

‘ If as many as are baptized, are baptized into his
 ‘ death, and are buried with him by baptism into his
 ‘ Death; that like as Christ was raised from the Dead,
 ‘ then we should walk in newness of Life.

‘ Then no doubt, but such as were baptized did first
 ‘ profess this Mortification, and consent to be buried,
 ‘ and revived with Christ, and to live to him in newness
 ‘ of Life, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 5, 6.

‘ For *Paul* was never so much for *Opus Operatum* above
 ‘ the Papists, as to think that the baptizing of an Infi-
 ‘ del might effect these high and excellent things, and
 ‘ he that professeth not Faith, nor never did, is to the
 ‘ Church an Infidel.

‘ In our baptism, we put off the Body of the Sins of
 ‘ the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ, being buried
 ‘ with him, and rising with him through Faith, quick-
 ‘ ned with him, and having all our Trespases forgiven,
 ‘ *Col.* 3. 11, 12, 13. And will any Man, (saith he,) yea
 ‘ will *Paul*, ascribe all this to those that did not profess
 ‘ the things signified, or the necessary Condition? Will
 ‘ baptism in the Judgment of a wise Man, do all this
 ‘ for an Infidel, (let me add, or to an Infant) or one
 ‘ (saith he,) that professeth not to be a Christian.

‘ Baptism is said to save us, *1 Pet.* 3. 21. and there-
 ‘ fore they that will be baptized, must profess the qua-
 ‘ lifications necessary to the saved, *p.* 32.

‘ The Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are put into the
 ‘ Churches Hands, and they that are loosed on Earth,
 ‘ are loosed in Heaven; (if the Keys do not err); and
 ‘ therefore pastors of the Church must absolve none

by

' by Baptism, that do not by profession seem absolvable in Heaven, they must profess to have the old Man Crucified with Christ, that the Bodie of Sin be destroyed, that henceforth they might not serve Sin, *Rom. 6. 5, 6, 7, 8.*

' As many as have been baptized into Christ, (saith he,) have put on Christ Jesus, and are *Abrahams Seed* and Heirs according to the Promise, *Gal. 3. 27, 28,* This speaks the Apostle of the probability grounded on a credible Profession, and therefore it is clear, that the profession was presupposed that might support this charitable Judgment.

' Our baptism is the solemnizing of our Marriage with Christ. And its a new and strang kind of Marriage, where there is no profession of Consent. † The † *Worthy Britains, see how Mr. Richard Baxter, hath cut down Infant Baptism with his own Sword; can Infants shew their consent to be married to Christ, or profess Faith in him.*

' baptized are in Scripture, called Men washed, Sanctified, Justified. They are all called Saints, and Churches of Saints, all Christians are called sanctified ones, or Saints, therefore it is certain, that they professed themselves such. Thus far *Mr. Richard Baxter.*

Sir, I thought fit to confute you in your bold Assertion, viz. that *John* the Baptist baptized all that came to him, even those Pharisees, that he called a Generation of Vipers, by making use of the Sword of *Goliath*; Reader, how this *Pedo-Baptists*, *Mr. Baxter*, hath not only overthrown *Mr. Owen's* argument here for Infant Baptism, but utterly hath overthrown Infant Baptism it self.

1. For (he saith) the Commission directeth Christ's Apostles to make Disciples, and then baptize them, *p. 27.*

2. (He saith,) the summ of that preaching that maketh Disciples, is repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ, *p. 30, 31.*

Where then is the Commission to baptize Infants, Baptism can't make them Disciples, nor their Parents Faith neither; no, 'tis the preaching of the word, he

that has not Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, is no Disciple of Christs.

You must have a new Commission to baptize unbelievers or Infants either, before ye ought to do it.

6. ' You say *John* came to prepare the way of the Lord, the end of his baptism was to bind all the People to believe in the Lord Jesus, which was to come. Faith was not the condition of *John's* Baptism, but the end thereof; his Baptism laid a particular obligation on all the Seed of *Abraham* to receive Christ, Childred as well as others, were bound to receive him when they came to Age, because Baptism was a sign of that obligation, &c.

Answer. Could you prove what you say, it was something to your Business, viz. that *John* baptized all, even ungodly Parents as well as Children, which Mr. *Baxter* from God's word hath fully confuted.

2. Also then it must follow, that the baptism of *John*, and that baptism administred by the Apostles, differed in an essential part, which you your self but a little before, do utterly deny, and affirm that they were both essentially, one and the same baptism, only one unto him that was to come, and the other into him that was come, Dead, and Risen again: Now, was not Faith and Repentance the condition of that Baptism administred by the Apostles; did not they require Faith, and a profession of Faith of all they admitted to Baptism; the Scriptures, Mr. *Baxter* cites in the aforementioned Book of his, fully proves they did, and that those things were prerequisites of it, therefore Baptism as administred by *John*, and by the Disciples of Christ, was not only to the end, they should be obliged to believe and repent, but Faith and Repentance was the condition or qualification of all they baptized. For *John* (nor the Apostles neither) would take a bare verbal profession of Repentance of those that came to Baptism; *John* commanded them to produce the Fruits of Repentance, or to bring forth Fruit meet for Repentance, and this was his way to prepare the way of the Lord, or to prepare a People for the Lord's Spiritual Building; he preached, Repent, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand. That Vow or Promise in Baptism that you dream of, prepares no Man for Christ, nor fits

any for his Church ; no. no, it must be Conversion, Faith, and Regeneration it self.

7. ' You say little Children were Members of the Church of God in the time of *John*, none can deny that, because Circumcision, the Seal of the Covenant, was upon them, all the Seed of *Abraham* were at that time God's visible Church, and they were his only Church upon Earth; they were not out of the Church before they were baptized, neither were they received into the Church of God through Baptism, as those that were out of it before, but the whole Nation were baptized, because they were Members of God's visible Church; and because little Children were Members of the visible Church, the Baptism of *John* appertained unto them.

1. *Answer*, I answer, we deny not but the *Jewish* Infants were Members of God's legal Church ; but I ask you whether *John*'s Baptism was a legal Ordinance, or a pure Gospel Ordinance, as Circumcision was, prove it ; we deny it, and say it was Evangelical, and did not appertain to the *Jews*, or the Seed of *Abraham*, according to the Flesh as such.

2. If you should prove it was a legal Ordinance, yet it doth not follow, Infants of the *Jews* ought to be baptized as their Males were to be Circumcised, because there was a clear positive command to circumcise them, but none to baptize them.

3. If you argue from the right of Circumcision, then it follows, that none but their male Infants ought to be baptized. What authority had *John* to baptize females, whether the adult or Infants, as I said before.

4. I am troubled to see how you confound your Peoples understanding, was the *Jewish* Church or the Visible Church of God under the Law, and the visible Gospel Church, formally and materially one and the same.

Had the *Jews* a right to all Gospel Ordinances and Privileges, because they abode his legal visible Church till the Death of Christ; we grant the invisible Church of God under Law and Gospel, is but one and the same; but doth not the Gospel Church in its Ordinances, Administrations, Rights and Privileges,

vastly differ from the legal, was not the visible Church of God under the Law, a National Church made up of the *Jewish* People only, and is the Gospel Church not congregational, consisting of both *Jews* and *Gentiles* that believe, or are born of the Spirit.

5. What, though *John* did not make void the Covenant of peculiarity God made with *Abraham*, yet he laid the *Ax* at the Root; and being to prepare matter for a new Church State, and his Ministry being Gospel, and the Ordinance he administered a Gospel Institution, he told the *Jews* and *Pharisees*, that their being *Abraham's* Seed, or having *Abraham* to their Father now, was no good *Plea* or Argument for them to plead, as a right to this new Administration. *John's* Doctrine did in part, finish the Law and the Prophets, or old covenant Dispensation, though the full period of it was not come till the death of Christ.

Hence our Saviour saith, *the Law and the Prophets were untill John, and from that time, the Kingdom of Heaven began to suffer Violence, and Men strove to press into it*, though its full and perfect beginning was not till our Lord had broken down the middle wall of Partition, and nail'd the legal Rites and carnal Ordinances to his Cross, and removed that enmity between *Jews* and *Gentiles*, making both one new Man, and so a new Gospel Church; pray take what one of your own Brethren, a *Pedo-Baptist* saith, of *John's* Ministration, it is *Reverend Cotton of New-England*.

Who speaking of this Text, *Mat. 3. 10. Now also the Ax is laid to the Root of the Trees.* 'The first (saith he) is the Root of *Abraham's* Covenant, which these People trusted upon, and of that it is which *John* the Baptist speaketh, now is the Ax laid to the Root of the Trees; think not to say within your Selves, we have *Abraham* to our Father, so that all their Confidence that they had in *Abraham's* Covenant, Temple and Tabernacle and such things, are burnt up, and so they have no Root left them to stand upon, and this is one thing intended by the Root. Again he saith, the Lord hath cut us off from hope, in the righteousness of our Parents, and from boasting of Ordinances; again saith he, this we read of, *Mal. 4. 1.* it is spoken of the ministry of *John* the Baptist, which did

‘ did burn as an *Oven* against all the *Scribes* and *Pharisees*,
 ‘ and left them neither the Root of *Abraham’s* Cove-
 ‘ nant, nor the branch of their own good Works, he
 ‘ cutteth them off from *Abraham’s* Covenant, &c. and
 ‘ by cutting them off from the Root, he leaveth them
 ‘ no Ground to trust on, *Cotton* on the Covenant,
 ‘ pag. 177, and p. 21, 22.

How direct is this to the purpose, and it as fully o-
 throweth all that you speak in this Argument ; this Re-
 verend Author Concludes, that *Abraham’s* Covenant made
 with his natural Seed as such, was cut down by *John*,
 though the Tree was not yet removed, nor the Chaff
 blown or fanned away; but you would make the Peo-
 ple believe, *John* confirmed that old Covenant right,
 and baptized all the *Jews* upon the Authority of *Abra-
 ham’s* Covenant ; as if instead of cutting the Tree
 down at the Root, he was about to plant it afresh, or
 uphold its standing, which had it been so, he would
 have rather said, *think to say within your selves, we have*
Abraham to our Father, for upon that foot of Account, I
am to baptize you all, you being all in God’s Covenant,
though you be a Generation of Vipers.

But how directly contrary to this Doctrine of yours
 did *John* preach to them’, and clearly took them off
 of any such a pretended right to Baptism, viz. because
 they were in Covenant with *Abraham*.

You say *John* did not cut down one Branch of
 that Covenant. Mr. *Cotton* says, he cut down the
 Tree at the Root ; you say, he baptized Infants upon
 that foot of account, but since, God’s Word speaks not
 one word of any such thing, ’Tis plain, you assert
 your own Fancies, or groundless suppositions.

‘ There is no doubt, say you, but that Parents
 ‘ brought their Children with them to the Baptism of
 ‘ *John*, for God commanded them to bring their Chil-
 ‘ dren with them into the Congregation, *Deut.* 29.
 ‘ 10, 11, 12, &c. their Zeal was great for their Chil-
 ‘ dren, *Acts* 15. 12. and 21. 20. therefore say you,
 ‘ if *John* refused their Children, they would not so
 ‘ willingly have come to his Baptism.

‘ They brought their Children to Christ ; therefore
 ‘ they brought their Children to the Baptism of
John.

Ans. I answer, you say no doubt but they brought their Children to *John's* Baptism, but without doubt they did not, say I; because if they had, it would without doubt have been written, but since it is no where written that they did do it; nor of *John's* baptizing one Infant, there is no doubt but we are in the right, viz. *John* baptized no Infants, nor any but penitent Persons, because he required Repentance, and the Fruits of it in all that came to his Baptism. Moreover,

2. Because all *Israel*, their little ones, their Wives and Strangers, the hewer of Wood, and drawer of Water, entered into that legal Covenant with God, Deut. 29. 10. 11. 12. doth it follow; that we in the Gospel times must bring all our Children and Servants to Baptism and the Lord's Supper; they had a command from God to do what they did, and that old Covenant Church state required them so to do; but God hath no more required us to bring our Infants to Baptism, then he hath required us to Circumcise them, or give our first born to the Lord, which was God's command to them under the Law.

Baptism, I tell you again, being of meer positive Right, you can draw no such Conclusions for what you plead for, 'tis only their Duty to be baptized, that Christ commanded to be baptized, and that is those that are made Disciples by the word preached, or those that believe in Christ, or that profess Faith in him; and 'tis the New Testament only, must inform us who are the subjects of Gospel Ordinances that depend only upon Laws meerly positive, according to the Sovereign Pleasure of the institutor of them, or holy Law-giver Jesus Christ.

' You say they brought their Children to Christ, therefore they brought them to *John's* Baptism.

Answer, If *John* had wrought Miracles and healed the Sick, I doubt not, but they would have brought their Children to him to have them healed, as well as they brought them to Christ, but *John* wrought no Miracles; also our Saviour was a healing the Sick when they brought Children to him; and it may fairly be inferred, they brought little Children that were distemper'd to him, to have him lay his Hands upon them, which was his way in healing the Sick, as I have said before.

' You

' You say Infant Baptism was an usual thing in the
' *Jewish* Church, several hundred years before the
' time of *John*, and tell us a story of *Moses Ben Maimon*,
' who collected the Rites of the ancient *Jewish* Church.

Answer, I have answered that already, you having
urged that argument before.

'Tis evident it was no other but a *Jewish* humane Tradition, if it be as you say; for God never commanded the *Jews* to baptize Infants, though you before would make your unwary Reader think that *Jacob* invented it. I am sorry to see such stuff from a Man of Learning.

What credit is to be given to the *Jewish Talmud*, what one *Jewish Rabbi* affirms, concerning this matter, I have shewed, another seems to deny, *Rabbi Joshua* confesseth that the *Jews* baptized Infants, *after the order of the Counsel*, not by any Authority from God by *Moses*, or any of his Holy Prophets, but shall we think *John* Baptized Infants by vertue of any human Tradition that was among the *Jews*.

Sir, a popish Tradition is of as good authority, as a *Jewish* one; you may affirm, the Papists for many hundred years baptized Infants, but where is it written in God's Word, that God commanded the *Jews* to baptize their Profelites, or that Christians ought to baptize their Infants: *to the Law and Testament*, the sacred Scripture is a perfect Rule.

' You say *John* baptized little Children, for he baptized the whole Nation in general, whereof Children were a great part; he refused none that came, or were brought to him, *Mat. 3. 5, 6.* then went out to him *Jerusalem* and all *Judea*, and all the Regions round about *Jordan*, and were baptized of him in *Jordan*. Now say you, if *John* baptized all *Jerusalem* and all *Judea*, and all the Regions round about *Jordan*, and all the People; it is certain he baptized Infants, unless we think there were no Children in *Jerusalem*, &c.

Answer, I answer, now you think you have done your Business; but Sir, doth not this Argument of yours as strongly prove, that all wicked and ungodly people may be baptized also, ye *Swearers*, *Whoremongers*, *Murderers*, yea the worst of Men, for can we think

think there were none such in *Jerusalem*, *Judah*, nor in all the Regions round about, yea that we may baptize *Pagans* and *Infidels*, for no doubt, but there were some of all Nations at *Jerusalem*.

2. You affirm that *John* baptized the whole Nation of the *Jews*, even every Man, Woman and Child, or else I mistake you; now if this were so, how it is said, *that Christ made and baptized more Disciples then John*, *John* 4. 1. *John* 3. 26. 'tis said that *Jesus* baptized, and all Men came to him. How did *John* baptize all, and *Christ* baptize more of the People then *John*; what think you, were they rebaptized; certainly, you will make them all proper Anabaptists; besides, if *John* baptized all the *Jews*, where were those three thousand that *St. Peter* and the other Disciples baptized, *Acts* 2. 40, 41, 42. were they not dwellers at *Jerusalem*, and notwithstanding *Christ* baptized more Disciples then *John*; yet 'tis said, *Acts* 1. 13. that the number of the Disciples that were at *Jerusalem* were but about one Hundred and Twenty.

3. I have shewed, that according to *Scripture Rhetoric* frequently by a *Synecdoche* a part is put for the whole, and sometimes the far lesser part also. 'Tis said, *All the Cattel in Egypt died*, *Exod.* 9. 6. that is, all that were in the Field: Also *Christ* saith, *When he was lifted up he would draw all men unto him*, *Joh.* 12. 32. Doth that intend all universally? So *Paul* saith, *All seek their own*: And *Christ* saith, *Ye shall be hated of all men for my name sake*. See these Scriptures, *Exod.* 32. 3, 26. *Jer.* 6. 3. *1 Cor.* 10. 7. *Isa.* 2. 2, 3. *Acts* 2. 5. See *Glossius Illiricus*, and other Tropical Writers: Also read *Philologia Sacra*, and our last Annotators on the Holy Bible, called *Poole's Annotations*, on this Text. 'The Term 'All, say they, here twice repeated, is enough to let 'us know, that 'tis often in Scripture significative no 'farther than *Many* — For it cannot be imagined, 'that every individual Person in *Jerusalem*, and the 'Regions round about *Jordan*, went to hear *John the Baptist*, but a great many.

Fromhence it appears, That it is no ground for Mr. Owen to affirm, that by all *Jerusalem*, and all *Judea*, &c. must be intended every individual Person, both Men, Women, and Children; but rather, some of all Sorts,

De.

Degrees, Sexes, &c. It shews, that Multitudes went to hear him, and many were baptized by him in *Jordan*, confessing their Sins with unfeigned Repentance.

But (you say) the Text doth not tell us what manner of Confession this was, whether in Words or Works: Their submission to Baptism, was an actual Confession of their Uncleanneſs, and that they stood in need of Washing, it cannot be thought that it was a Confession in Words; because one Man could not receive a particular Confession from the whole Country if they made a Confession in Words: It is like one made it in the Names of others, even as the Priests did in the Names of all the People, *Levit. 16. 21.* Thus the Parents might confess their Sins for themselves and their Children, &c.

1. *Ans.* Let Mr. *Baxter's* Arguments serve to confute you here; he tells you, That from Scripture and the universal Practice of the ancient Church, That Faith, and a Confession of Faith, yea a verbal Confession, was requir'd of all that were baptized; *With the heart man believeth, and with the mouth confession is made to salvation, Rom. 10. 10.*

2. Certainly you are strangely left to blindness of Mind about this Matter: Did ever any Man, except your self, and one Mr. *Excel*, whom I answered lately, affirm, That all ungodly and unbelieving Men and Women, that were willing to be baptized, were proper and fit Subjects of Sacred Baptism? For all Men may see, that this Argument of yours is for their Baptism, and as forcible to prove they ought to be baptized, as 'tis to prove the Baptism of Infants: For, if *John* baptized all the whole Country, even every individual Person, then Ministers now may baptise all in all Nations, even all the World, let them be what they will, *Turks, Pagans, Infidels, Swearers, Drunkards, and Idolaters, Thieves, Murderers*, if they will but promise to turn from their Sins and repent, whether they do it or no, yet, if your Argument be good, they ought to be baptized: But how contrary to this is that which all your Brethren generally assert? *viz.* That in the Primitive Times, when the Gospel was first preached and Churches planted, all that were first baptized were Believers, Saints, and godly Persons, and upon their Faith their Children were (as they say) baptized

tized also, which is that we deny ; tho' they are right as to what they speak in respect of Believers themselves ; but, since we have so fully refuted what you say of Baptizing adult Persons that are Unbelievers, I will say no more of that in this place.

3. 'Tis evident what you affirm is false, viz. That *John* baptized the whole Country, even every individual Person, and that by a plain Instance: Is it not said, That *the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of him*, Luke 7. 30. That is, saith our Annotators, not receiving *John's* Doctrine of Repentance, for the remission of Sins and bringing forth Fruits worthy of amendment of Life, not submitting to Baptism, as a Testimony of such a Repentance. For *John's* Baptism signifieth his whole Administration. See *Pool's Annotations* on that Place. All may see what a kind of Confession it was, *John's* Baptism required ; it was more than a verbal Confession of Sin, even the Fruits of a changed Heart, and a new Life: And where this Doctrine of his was not received, and these Fruits appeared not, *John* would not baptize them.

And now to conclude with this Chapter, in opposition to what Mr. *Owen* saith, from the whole it clearly doth follow, That *John Baptist* did not baptize the whole Country, nor any one Infant, no not any one Person, but such who believed and seemed at the least to bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance: And, as he says, *John's* Baptism was the beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, it followeth, that no Infant ought to be baptized, and that the external Privileges of the Gospel are restrained and not so large as were the outward Rites and Privileges of the *Jewish Church*, tho' the Spiritual Privileges of the Gospel are larger and more extensive than those of the Law were.

C H A P. XVI.

In which it is proved, That the Children of the Faithful, as such, ought not to be baptized, because 'tis said whole Households were baptized: Being an Answer to what Mr. James Owen hath said in his 13th Chapter, and so a Confutation of his Tenth Argument for Infant Baptism.

MR. Owen saith, it was God's way from the beginning of the World, to receive whole Households into Covenant, the Children were received in with their Parents; even so *Noah* and his Family were in the same Covenant, for his sake his Family was received with him into the Ark, and were baptized with him in the Waters of the Flood: *Abraham* believed, and his whole Family was received into God's Covenant with him, *Gen. 17. Heb. 11. 7. 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21.* Not himself and his Seed, but his Men-Servants and Maid-Servants, and of the *Gentiles*, that were willing to receive the true Religion, and their Seed, *Gen. 17. 23. Exod. 12. 40.* And so God's Covenant continued in the Families of the Faithful, until the coming of Christ, for near four thousand Years. If any say, that the Dispensation is altered, and the Members rent from the Head of Families, let them shew a plain Scripture for it.

1. *Ans.* I answer; As touching that Covenant God made with *Noah* and his Family, it was not only made with him and his Family, but with all the World, for they were the Representatives of all that should live on the Earth; nay, and not only Mankind, but with Fowls of the Air and Beasts of the Field. See *Gen. 9. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.* And God spake unto *Noah*, and to his sons, Verse 8. And I, behold I will establish my covenant with you, and your Seed after you, Verse 9. And with

every living creature that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattel, and of every beast of the earth with you, from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth, Ver. 10. And I will establish my covenant with you, neither shall all flesh be cut off any more by the waters of a flood: neither shall there any more be a flood to destroy the earth, Verse 11.

Now to what purpose do you mention this Covenant, or the temporal Salvation of *Noah's* Family in the Ark? May be *Noah's* Family, or some of them, were saved with that external Salvation for his sake; yet this proves not that his Faith extended to the Spiritual Salvation of the Souls of his Children, for he had a cursed *Cham* to one of his Sons, his Faith could not save him.

2. As to the Ark being a Type of Baptism, or that his Family were baptized in the Ark, this, as I have once before told you, doth as much tend to prove that all the World may be baptized, even the good, and bad, and Cattle also, as any in particular; for all, in the Ark, were as truly baptized, as any that were in it.

3. Had you said *Noah's* Family was a Type of the Gospel-Church, you had spoken something to the purpose; for so Expositors intimate, and not without good Reason. And,

1. As all his Family were received into the Ark, so all the Members of the Gospel-Church were by Faith to be received into Christ, the Anti-Type of the Ark.

2. As *Noah* built the Ark according to the Commandment of God, so Christ built his Church, and did every thing according to the Commandment of his Father.

3. *Noah* took many Trees well hewen and fitted to build the Ark; so Christ takes many Believers, who are Spiritually well hewed and fitted by the Word and Spirit, to build his Church, who are called *trees of righteousness*, chosen People, as *Noah* built the Ark of such Trees or Wood, God himself chose.

4. As some clean and unclean Beasts were received into the Ark, yea and a *Cham* who was an ungodly Person, so this might figure forth, that some un sanctified

Persons (tho' not by God's appointment) would get into, or be received into the Gospel-Church. And,

5. As all that were not received into the Ark perished, so all who get not Spiritually into Christ by Faith, or are not Members of the visible or invisible Church, shall be damned and perish eternally.

6. As *Noah's Ark* was sometimes, (no doubt,) overwhelmed or covered with Waves, and those that were in it; so all true Believers, that are Members of the true Gospel-Church, ought to be dipped, baptized, or overwhelmed in Water. And, as Sir *Norton Knatchbal* observes, 'The Ark was a Figure of the Resurrection. (Speaking of that Text) Mr. *Owen* cites *1 Pet. 3. 20.* (saith he,) Baptism which now saves us by Water, that is, by the assistance of Water, is Antipical of the Ark of *Noah*, and it doth not signify the laying down of the filth of the Flesh, but the Covenant of a good Conscience towards God, while we are plunged in the Water, which is to testify our belief of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ; so that there is a manifest *Antithesis* between these words by Water, and by the Resurrection: Nor is the Elegancy of it displeasing. The Ark of *Noah*, not the Flood, was a Type of Baptism; and Baptism was the Anti-type of the Ark, not as if Baptism is a washing away of the Filth of the Flesh by Water, wherein it answers not all to the Ark; but, as it is the Covenant of a good Conscience towards God by the Resurrection of Christ, in the belief of which Resurrection we are saved, as they were saved by the Ark of *Noah*; for the Ark and Baptism were both a Type and Figure of the Resurrection, so that the proper End of Baptism ought not to be understood as if it were a Sign of the washing away of Sin, altho' it be thus oftentimes taken *Metonymically* in the *New Testament*, and by the Fathers, but a particular Signal of the Resurrection by Faith in the Resurrection of Christ; of which Baptism is a lively and emphatical Figure; as also was the Ark out of which *Noah* returned as from the Sepulchre to a new Life. Thus far Sir *Norton Knatchbal* in his Notes printed at *Oxford*, 1677, who though a great Pedo-Baptist, yet denied sprinkling or pouring to be Baptism.

Now this hath teaching in it, and shews the Sente of the Apostle *Peter's* Words very fully no doubt. ut to tell the World, because God saved, and covenanted with *Noah's* Family; therefore God takes whole Families in Gospel times into Covenant, argues great darkness.

2. As to *Abraham's* Family, we deny not but his Family was taken into Covenant with God, even his natural Seed as such, but it was a covenant of peculiarity; for simply considered, as a Family they were not taken into the Covenant of Grace; because there where some godly Families that had no lot or part in that Covenant, but we having fully opened the twofold Covenant God made with *Abraham* at the beginning; I shall not renew the Argument again.

But worthy *Brittains*, let this be well considered by you, that as *Noah's* Family and *Abraham's* Family were taken into Covenant with God and other, whole Households under the Law, and the whole House and Nation of *Israel*, so they were Types of the Gospel Church, even as the whole House or Family of *Abraham*, (or whole House and Family of *Israel* were typically relatively and federally holy;) it did prefigure that true spiritual Holiness, that in Gospel times should be in all the members of the true Gospel Church, and not of God's taking under the Gospel whole Families into Covenant with himself, either into an outward external Covenant, or into a spiritual or new Covenant relation with himself.

'Tis true, God perhaps hath sometimes called whole Families, both Parents, Children and Servants, and converted them all; but alas, how many Families are there, where may be, but one is called, and in sacred Covenant with God, may be the Husband and not the Wife, the Wife and not the Husband, the Child, and not either of the Parents are so called and taken into Covenant with God. Pray worthy *Brittains*, consider well what God speaks of his Promise under the Gospel. *I will take one of a City, and two of a Family, and will bring you to Zion. Jer. 3. 14.* Not in Gospel times whole Families, no no, this God may do, but 'tis more then he hath promised; or as to matter of Fact is so; he doth frequently speak in another

I may speak here as the Apostles speaks in another Case, *you see your calling Brethren, how not many whole Families are called.*

3. Because God made a Covenant with *Abraham*, and his natural Seed, as such, as a Covenant of peculiarality, and also with him made or renewed the Covenant of Grace, setting him up as a covenanting Head on a double respect; doth it follow, that every believing Man is set or placed by the Lord, as a like Covenant head to all his natural Off-spring: Till Mr. *Owen* hath proved this, he saith nothing to the purpose.

In the Covenant of Circumcision that appertained to all *Abraham's* natural Seed, were many external Priviledges and Promises made, of which Circumcision was given as a Sign or Token, as particularly the Land of *Canaan*, &c.

But what Priviledges and Promises hath God granted to Believers Children, as such, in Gospel times which Baptism gives them an assurance of; the sign is nothing without the substance or thing signified; Believers have the substance or the things signified in Baptism, so have not Infants in their pretended Baptism, nor many of them ever after.

4. Whereas you call for a plain Scripture to prove that the Children of the Faithful are rent from the Head of the Family; you mistake the Business; you must prove that in the Gospel Dispensation, Children and Servants, or whole Households are taken with the Heads of those Households into Covenant with God: What whole Nation is taken into Covenant with God, as the whole House or Nation of *Israel* was under the Law; prove, that there is such a Nation, and we will grant, that all the Families in that Nation, are also in Covenant, for in that universal Family all particular Families must needs be comprehended.

You proceed to the Gospel times, and mention *Zachaeus*, who as soon as converted, the Lord Jesus said, *this day is Salvation come to this House, for as much as he also is a Son of Abraham*, Luke, 19. 9 10.

1. *Ans.* I answer, you do your Business effectually, if you can prove, that so soon as the Father believes, Salvation comes to belong to all that are in his House; I thought you argued for some external Priviledge,

only for the Children upon their Parents Faith ; but it appears, 'tis no less then Salvation it self, even eternal Salvation ; for it was such a Salvation that came to *Zacheus* that day. O happy Children of Believers if this were true ! For then it follows, that all the Children of the faithful must of necessity be saved, whether they in their own Persons believe or not ; nay, and happy Servants too, for they must all be saved, because part of the Family ; but what credit is there to be given to a Man that talks after the manner as you do, is this true or false ? for what do you mean less then what I say and doth ; Eternal Salvation come to all in that Family or House, when the Head of it doth believe, you ought to repent for spreading such grand errors among the People.

‘ Christ you say, explaineth *Abraham’s* Covenant, in ‘ *Gen. 19.* which God made with him and his Family, ‘ or his Seed, because he was a Son to *Abraham* ; as if ‘ he should say, though this Man hath been a great ‘ Sinner, and though he hath been chief Publican, yet ‘ because he did repent, and receive the mediator of ‘ the Covenant of Grace, *Abraham’s* Covenant, and ‘ the Priviledges thereof do belong unto him, and to ‘ his Household. He is a Son of *Abraham*, therefore ‘ *Abraham’s* Covenant belongs to him, in the same Latitude to him and his Seed ; many judge that *Zacheus* ‘ was one of the *Geniles*, for usually such were *Publicans*, and this they gather from these words of Christ, ‘ for so much as he also is a Son of *Abraham* ; he also, ‘ though he is not a natural Seed to *Abraham*, yet he ‘ is one of his Spiritual Seed, and therefore *Abraham’s* ‘ Covenant belongs unto him and his Household, &c.

Ans. I answer, your own explanation of this Text overthrows all you strive to prove, were it but considered.

‘ 1. For you grant he was not one of the natural Seed of *Abraham* ; now we say, that all that do believe are the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, and so such to whom the Covenant of Grace, God made with *Abraham*, (and consequently eternal Life) doth belong ; for the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* cannot miss of eternal Salvation, the promise is sure to all the Seed, *Rom. 4. 16.* Now then if your Eyes were opened, you might quickly

quickly see that *Abraham* was a two-fold Father, and that he had a two-fold Seed; you know that all *Abrahams* natural Seed, and the natural Seed of Believers, are not the Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, nor have the promise of Salvation sure to them.

2. From hence it appears, Salvation could not come to *Zacheus* Children, (if he had any) unless they as well as himself did believe, and receive by Faith the Blessing of the Covenant of Grace God made with *Abraham*; because none are *Abraham's* Sons or Spiritual Seed, but Believers only, whether *Jews* or *Gentiles*, if you be *Christs*, then you are *Abraham's* Seed.

3. Therefore if Salvation came to every individual Person in *Zacheus* Family, they all did believe as well as himself, though it be not expressed. But,

4. Salvation might be said to come to his House, because the Saviour and means of Salvation was that day come to his House.

5. Salvation might be said to come to his House that day, though it came only to *Zacheus* himself, it coming to the head of the Family, it may be said to come to his House, and yet not to every particular Person in that House, but you bring in this Objection, viz. but what is this to Baptism.

You answer, if Salvation came to his House or Family, then Baptism belonged unto them.

2. 'It is probable, that *Zacheus* and his Household were baptized before by *John*, for the *Publicans* came to be baptized of him, *Luke* 3. 12. and 7. 29.

1. *Ans.* I answer, you may be sure when *Zacheus* believed in Christ, he was a proper Subject of Gospel Baptism, so were all that believed who were in his House; but the Text doth not say, that every particular Person that were in his House believed, or that Salvation came so to his House, but if it did, no doubt they were all upon their believing baptized.

2. But you may well say, what is this to Baptism, since he and all his House were baptized before, even when he was in his Sins, and a notorious Sinner, the chief of the *Publicans*; it is probable say you, sure Sir, 'tis more then probable, it was impossible, that *Zacheus* and his Family should escape Baptism, when *John* had baptized all the whole Country before, all,

yea every individual Person that dwelt in *Jerusalem*, *Judea*, and all the Regions round about: The truth is, this is very impertinently brought in to prove Infant Baptism; what doth it signifie, that Salvation was come to *Zacheus* that day, and not until then, seeing *John's* Commission was to baptize all, whether Godly or Ungodly, Believers or Unbelievers, whether Salvation was come to them or not; let the Reader observe, what darkness and ignorance this Man shews.

'*Peter*, (say you) when he first planted the Christian Religion among the *Jews*, exhorted them saying, *be baptized every one of you, for the promise is to you, and to your Children.*

Ans. This of the promise being unto them and to their Children, we have fully already answered; but why doth *Peter* command these *Jews* (who doubtless dwelt at *Jerusalem*) to be baptized, seeing *John* Baptist had baptized them and their Children before, as you have positively asserted; what must they be all rebaptized, what inconsistency is there in your arguing?

2. The latitude of this Command, *be baptized every one of you*, is no further then to all them that he commands to repent, nor is the promise to any of their Children, but such that the Lord our God shall all the Parents right and interest to the promise of the Holy Spirit, Remission of Sins, and eternal Life, spring from their Interest in Christ by Faith, and at that Door comes in the right and interest of all their Children or Off-spring that are called by the effectual operations of the word and spirit of God, 'tis the promise made to all the true spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, but are the natural Seed of *Abraham*, and the natural Seed of Believers, as such, or as so considered the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*?

3. the promise here meant, and the duty of being baptized are as you say of the same Latitude; thus you argue, *viz.* be baptized you and your Children, 'for the promise is unto you and to your Children, 'we so are to understand the Words; the Promise, and 'the Duty, being of the same Latitude, if the Promise 'belongeth unto them and their Children, then bap-

Ans. I answer, what is the promise but the Holy-Ghost and eternal Life, and such that receive this Promise, viz. the holy Spirit as an earnest of eternal Life, we deny not are to be baptized, and if no Child hath any other right to the Duty, but such who have received the same Promise through Faith, viz. remission of Sin, and of the Holy Spirit, then no Children but such that repent and believe ought to be baptized, seeing the Promise and Duty runs to the Children or Off-spring as it runs to the Parents.

‘ In the same manner, you say, when *Peter* planted the first Church among the *Gentiles*, as might be gathered from the words of the Angel to *Cornelius*, being the first Fruits of the Church of the *Gentiles*, *Acts* 11. 13. send Men to Joppa and call for Simon, whose Sir-name is Peter, who shall tell thee words whereby thou and all thy House shall be saved; the Gospel bringeth Salvation to him and to all his House; *Cornelius* well knew the meaning of the Words, for he being a proselite to the true Religion before that time, though uncircumcised, yet received the severe Commandment of *Noah*, the substance of which might be seen, *Gen.* 9. 1. God’s Covenant was with *Noah* and his Seed, &c.

1. *Ans.* I answer, ’tis said *Peter* should tell *Cornelius* words, whereby he and all his House shall be saved, but it must be such of his House that could hear and understand those Words *Peter* should tell them; he shall tell thee, and tell all thy House Words whereby you shall be saved, but not unless he and they of his House believed; and pray observe, is it not said he was a devout Man, and one that feared God with all his House, *Acts* 10. 2. all his House, the Holy-Ghost here intends, were such who were of understanding, and did fear God as well as himself, also *Cornelius* said to *Peter*, now we are all here to hear what things are commanded thee of God, all his House were capable to hear, &c. Moreover, is it not said, while *Peter* yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on them, which heard the word Verse 44. and all these were commanded to be baptized, viz. that had received the Holy-Ghost for their reception of the Holy-Ghost, is that argument the Apostle uses to command them to be baptized, Verse 47.

can any Man forbid water, that these should not be baptized which have received the Holy-Ghost as well as we, and he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord, Verse 48, them that did believe? them that had received the Holy-Ghost, them that spake with Tongues and magnified God; and if it was every individual Person in his House, let it be so, the greater Grace of God was manifested, but here are no Children mentioned in Infancy that were baptized.

2. Besides, I wonder at you, 'tis said *Peter should tell Cornelius words, whereby he and all his House should be saved*, sure you do not believe what you seem to plead for; pray answer, when the Parent believes, and is saved, or assured of Salvation, are 'all his Children and whole Family by his Faith brought into the like state of Salvation, shall they all be saved also Through his Faith? the external Priviledges of the Covenant that your Brethren talk of (that is something, but I know not what) by virtue of their Parents Faith, it is not however that which you plead for; you tell us when *Cornelius* heard words whereby he came to be saved, all his Family through his Faith were saved also, if you do not this, I profess I know not what you mean, by what you have written; but if this be your meaning, I hope no Body will believe you, because all know it is utterly false.

3. But the greater wonder comes at last, viz. it appears *Cornelius* and his Household because a *Gentile*, had right to Baptism by the Covenant and Commandment of God to *Noah*, not by virtue of *Abraham's* Covenant; the Truth is, one is as good an Argument for Baptism as the other, but was the Covenant God made with *Noah* the Covenant of Grace; if it was, all the World are in the Covenant of Grace, and not Mankind only, but the *Fowls of the Air*, and *Beasts of the Field*, and it had a Sign or Seal also to confirm it to all, viz. the *Rainbow*, now your argument from hence must be this, because the Sign or Seal of the *Rainbow* belonged to *Noah* and his Sons, to confirm the Covenant Blessings, therefore Baptism belongs to all Gods *Noahs*, and their Sons and Daughters; and you may extend the inference further if you please, but perhaps 'tis rather the command of God to *Noah*; you cite

Gen. the ninth Chapter and first Verse, and that was given to *Noah* and his three Sons, *Shem*, *Ham* and *Japheth*, and in them to all the World; well but what is this Command, take the words, and *God blessed Noah and his Sons, and said unto them be fruitful and multiply and replenish the Earth*; I know not what this is brought for, nor what *Cornelius* could draw from thence, unless it was to stir up his Sons and Daughters to marry and beget Children, which certainly is one thing if not all that God commands, *Gen. 9. 1.* to *Noah* and his Sons, that so the World might be a fresh increased and multiplyed with People after the Flood.

2. 'You say, he could no less then know the rest of the Profelytes who received Circumcision, that they and their Children were in *Abraham's* Covenant, and also he at this time by his receiving the Gospel, should come into the same Covenant, so that he and his whole House should be the first Fruits of the Gentiles. Thus *Peter* founded the Christian Church of the *Jews* and *Gentiles* in Housholds, according to the ancient practice from the beginning of the World.

Ans. I answer, 'tis a great abuse of the sacred History, to say *Peter* founded the Christian Churches in particular Housholds, for the first Church consisted of Three Thousand, and there is no mention made of any particular Household; but perhaps *two of a City, and one of a Family*, as God promised, were at that time brought into God's Gospel *Sion*; also here were many gathered together at *Cornelius's* House, as appears *Verse 33.*

2. Why, do you not distinguish between the Covenant made with *Abraham's* natural Seed, as such, and the Covenant of Grace God made with him, &c. you think that those blind and unbelieving circumcised Profelytes were as truly in the covenant of Grace, even in the same covenant God made with *Abraham's* spiritual Seed, as *Cornelius* was after he believed in God and Jesus Christ; why then doth *Paul* say, and if you be *Christ's*, then are you *Abrahams* Seed and Heirs according to the promise, *Gal. 3. 29.* besides the Covenant of peculiariality made with *Abraham's* natural Seed, as such, did not intitle the Profelyte stranger to the inheritance

of the Land of *Canaan*. Oh! that the Lord would take this Vail from off your Eyes, every Soul must reckon from Christ, not from being *Abraham's* natural Seed, that would be one of *Abraham's* spiritual Seed, and an Heir according to the Promise.

' *Paul* you say, planted or founded Churches among the *Gentiles*, even in the same manner as *Peter* did, when the head of the Families believed he did baptize the whole Family,

1. ' You say, he planted the Church of the *Philippians* in Households, *Acts* 16. 14, 15. a certain Woman named *Lydia* which worshipped God, heard us, whose Heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things that were spoken off by *Paul*, and when she believed, she was baptized and all her Household. You note on this Text three things; first, that *Lydia* was a Profelyte before to the *Jewish* Religion, and the Profelytes of the *Gentiles* and their Children, were in God's Covenant through Baptism and Circumcision; and here you tell us the story over again of *Moses* the Son of *Maimon*, about baptizing Profelytes, that they baptized Profelytes among the *Jews*, by command of the Council, &c.

Ans. I answer, you will have I see all these to be re-baptized also; I cannot see but you are truly a grand Anabaptists in your Judgment, and such an one that I never met with before; first you intimate they were baptized by a *Jewish* humane Invention, and the second time baptized by virtue of Christ's command, let who will be your Profelyte, I will not; who thus contend for, and mix the Traditions of Men with Christ sacred Institutions.

2. Had *Lydia* and her Family a right to Baptism because a Profelyte? I thought your Brethren always asserted her Childrens right thereunto by virtue of her Faith.

' Secondly, you note as soon as she believed, she and her Household were baptized.---according to the order of Gods covenant to receive the faithful and their Seed, &c.

1. *Ans.* I answer, then Baptism it appears is no near positive command of Christ, but wholly depends upon Gods Covenant with *Noah*, or else his Covenant with *Abraham*.

2, You

2. You ought first to prove she had any Seed, either Sons or Daughters, and if she had, whether any of them were Infants.

3. Prove, that because her Household is said to be baptized, every individual person in her House was baptized, seeing we read of a whole House *went up to offer unto the Lord, but not all, two of the House went not up*, 1 Sam. 1. 21. 22.

4. Prove that *Paul* planted a Church in her House, if he did, I shall make it appear, that they were all adult Persons, and such that did believe in Christ; and as to your argument, that in the New Testament whole Families received the Gospel, 'tis not denied, but some whole Households then did believe, or the major part of them, and so now adays, but not many such, but would you therefore have Churches to consist only of private Families. This is a new way to prove national Churches.

' You say after the same manner, the Apostle offered Salvation to the *keeper of the Prison* and his Household, if he only believed, *Acts* 16. 30. 31. and he said, *believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved and thy House*.

' *Paul* explaineth unto him the Covenant of God to the Faithful and their Seed, saying unto him, *believe, and thou shalt be saved and thy House*, he doth not say, *thou shalt be saved and thy House* if ye believe, but *believe thou, and thy House shall be saved with thee*, the promise of Salvation belongeth to the Household, if he believed who was the head of the Family, &c.

Ans. Sir, I positively charge you for writing and publishing false Doctrine, and acquit your self of it as well as you can; I appeale to the Consciences of your Brethren, and to all understanding Men, whether this be a truth or not, *viz.* that when the head of a Family doth believe in Christ, that all the whole Family shall be saved; I must confess that this is a new and easie way for all in such Families to be saved, but doth not Christ say, *he that believes shall not be damn'd*, Mark 16. 16. let them dwell in what Family they will, you do not speak of any external Covenant right to Baptism, but of Salvation it self.

2. You

2. You do not speak of Infants as such, but of all in the Family or Household, *viz.* comprehending adult Sons and Daughters, Men Servants or Maid Servants; adult persons it appears from hence, in the primitive times were baptized, by virtue of the Parents Faith as well as Babes; nay, and were saved also by the Faith of the head of the Family.

3. Doth it not also follow, that your ignorance of God's Covenant with *Abraham* is very great, for if it be as you say, then all *Abraham's* Seed according to the Flesh must be saved, because he as the Head of his Family believed; but doth not the Scripture say in opposition to this, that *though the number of the Children of Israel be as the Sand of the Sea, yet but a Remnant shall be saved.*

4. May not this Doctrine of yours also corrupt and tend to ruine many poor Souls, both Children and Servants, who live in Families where the Heads of those Families do believe, and are Godly; may not they say we shall be saved, though we believe not, because we dwell in a Family where the Head, *viz.* our Father, our Master doth believe; Mr. *Owen* assures us, we shall all be saved, because our Father or Master believes, *be astonish'd, Oh ye Heavens!* is this your proof for Infant Baptism. *Worthy Britains*, this may sufficiently shew you that the Covenant that God made with *Abraham*, namely, the Covenant of Circumcision, which was made with him and his natural Seed as such, was no Covenant of Salvation, and so not the Covenant of Grace; 'tis so plain you need not doubt of it, because multitudes that were in that Covenant perished, though Circumcision was a Seal of *Abrahams* Faith, yet not a Seal of the Covenant of Grace to his Seed, as such, because if it were it would have Sealed to them all, the righteousness of Faith and eternal Life, which we know it never did to multitudes of them. But very remarkable 'tis, to see how Mr. *Owen* doth in the very next place both comfort himself, and overthrow his Argument, as to the purport of it, he brings in this Objection,

Object. *All his Family believed*, vers. 34. Take his Answer.

Ans. 'I answer, (saith he) so were the adult; the whole House sometimes signifies those of the adult in a Family, it is said of *Sampson*, that *all his Fathers House buried him*, that is (saith he) those that were of age in his Fathers House, for the little Children could not go into the Land of the *Philistines* to bury his Body, &c.

'It is said (saith he) of *Cornelius* that he was a devout Man, fearing God with all his House, that is, all the adult in his Household, so the *Goaler* believed with all his Household, viz. all that were of age to believe.

2. 'And we are not to think (saith Mr. *Owen*) all these Households to be barren, which were baptized by the Apostles; there were not many Households in those Ages, without Children in them, for the greatest part of their Riches was their Bond Servants, and the Children born of them, and those Children were in God's Covenant, even as free-born Children, *Gen.* 17. 13, 23. so are they also under the Gospel, they are *Abraham's* Seed through the Faith of their Parents and Heirs as before, *Col.* 1. 12. *Gal.* 3. 29.

Ans. 1. I need give no further Answer touching this argument, concerning what you say of whole Households, you have effectually answered your self; you affirm that by whole Households or Families in the Scripture, sometimes none but the adult are comprehended or meant, and that Instance of *Sampson* doth sufficiently prove it, little Children could not go to bury his dead Body; though 'tis said all his Fathers House buried him. So say we by whole Houses that were said to be baptized, none are meant but those adult Persons who believed.

2. You say and confesse, that *Cornelius* and all his House feared God, and that the *Goaler* and all his House believed, that is all the adult (say you) believed, or that were at age to believe; this may serve to clear up the matter touching all the other whole Households that were said to be baptized, God constrains you to speak the Truth here, though it be to overthrow your whole Argument.

2. But what you speak in the next place is not true, viz. that Parents and their Children, and Bond Servants, and their Children, were under the Law, and under the Gospel times; also in the Covenant of Grace, through the Faith of their Parents: For notwithstanding the Bond-men and their Male Children were commanded to be Circumcised that were in *Abraham's* Family, and that were as Profelytes received into other Families of the *Jews* under the Law, yet they were not Heirs of the Land of *Canaan*; none but the natural Seed of *Abraham* could have any possession therein, according to that Covenant of peculiarity God made with the fleshy Seed of *Abraham* as such, which typified forth that none but Believers, or the elect of God, who are the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, were the true Heirs of the Promise, and of the Heavenly *Canaan*; will you say that all the natural Seed of *Abraham* and Bond-Men and their Children as such, and also all the natural Seed of Believers as such, are the true Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*; sure God will take of this Vail from your Eyes, and open your understanding if you look to him by Prayer, and search the Scripture with a candied desire after the knowledge of this matter.

3. You will find a great difference between the Covenant that peculiarly did appertain to the natural Seed of *Abraham* as such, and the Covenant of Grace made with *Abraham* and his true Spiritual Seed as such.

4. I have proved that neither *Abraham's* Faith nor the Parents Faith intitles any of their natural Seed as such, to the inheritance or blessings purchased by Jesus Christ, viz. *Justification, Adoption, Pardon of Sin, and eternal Life*, no, no, the Children of the Flesh, (as such) these are not the Children of God, but the Children of the promise are counted for the Seed, viz. those that are the elect of God only, *Rom. 9. 6, 7, 8, 9.* are the Children of the promise, and Heirs of Glory; the promise runs *Gal. 3. 16.* not to Seeds as of many, but to thy Seed which is Christ, i. e. Christ personally considered primarily, and then to Christ mystically considered, that is all that are spiritually united to him; therefore the Apostle saith, *Verse 29. if ye be Christs,*
then

then are you Abraham's Seed and Heirs according to the promise, or according to the Covenant of Grace God made with Abraham.

5. This must be so, because the Covenant of Grace is well ordered in all things and sure ; see once again, *Rom. 4. 14. for if they which are of the Law be Heirs, Faith is made void, and the promise of no effect, no need of Faith, if the legal Covenant can save any Man ; but if a personal Obedience to the Law could not save the Parent, besure the Faith and Obedience of the Parent cannot save the Child. But observe, vers. 16. therefore it is of Faith, that it might be by Grace to the end, the promise might be sure to all the Seed.* Now consider well the promise is eternal Life, this all understand here, and this saith Paul is sure to all the Seed ; 'tis confirmed not only by the word of God, but by the Oath of God also, *Heb. 6. 13 for when God made promise to Abraham because he could swear by no greater, he swore by himself ; to shew the Heirs of the Promise, the immutability of his Counsel, he confirmed it by an Oath—that so the Heirs of the promise might have strong Consolation, vers. 17. 18. all that are the true Heirs or spiritual Seed of Abraham must be saved, for 'tis impossible for God to lye, or fail in his Promise, to any one of the true Seed of Abraham ; therefore if all the natural Seed of Abraham were in this Covenant, and all the natural Seed of Believers, 'tis impossible that any one of them should perish eternally, or miss of eternal Life.*

They are all born of God, and Heirs as *Isaac* was, they are all chosen from Everlasting to Salvation, they are all given to Christ, and all Members of his mystical Body, or are but one mystical Christ, and are even *Flesh of his Flesh, and Bone of his Bone*, and therefore this Covenant and free promise of God, cannot appertain to *Abraham's* natural Seed as such, nor to the natural Seed of Believers as such, for alas ! how many of them do perish eternally ? *For though the number of the Children of Israel be as the Sands of the Sea, yet but a remnant of them shall be saved*, as was hinted before.

' But say you, if the keeper of the Prison had no Children, or if they were the adult, it is the same thing, the Apostle offereth Salvation to him and to his

‘ his Household, even to little Children, if there were
 ‘ such with him, and that is sufficient to confirm the
 ‘ present matter, *i. e.* that by this Household, we are
 ‘ to understand principally his Children, as the word
 ‘ frequently is taken in Scripture, *Gen.* 30. 30. and
 ‘ 45. 19. *Num.* 3. 15. 1 *Tim.* 5. 8.

Ans. It appears, you question whether the *Goaler*
 had any Children or not, beside you tell us, that whole
 Households comprehend the Adult only some times;
 from whence I infer according to the Scripture, whole
 Households may be said to be baptized, when none but
 the Adult in those Households are baptized.

2. If the Apostles offering Salvation to People, gives
 them a right to Baptism, then all the World may be
 baptized, because all the World ought to have Salva-
 tion offered to them, *go into all the World and preach*
the Gospel to every Creature, Mark 16. 15. but this of-
 fer gives none a right to Baptism simply in it self; no
 none but such that believe as the next Words prove,
he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, verse 16.
 they must first believe or be made Disciples, and then
 be baptized, the Parents must believe, and the Chil-
 dren must first believe, not the Parents for the Chil-
 dren, but the Children must believe for themselves, be-
 fore they ought to be baptized, according to the Com-
 mission, and the nature of the Administration of Gos-
 pel Baptism.

3. 'Tis strange the Apostles should preach to little
 Children, or offer Christ to them, what preach Christ
 to the Infant in the Cradle? that knows not its right
 Hand from its left.

‘ But say you, the Children are the chief part of e-
 ‘ very Household; therefore when *Paul* saith to the
 ‘ Keeper of the Prison, *believe on the Lord Jesus, and*
 ‘ *thou shalt be saved and thy House*; it is as much as if
 ‘ he should say, if thou wilt believe in Christ, the Co-
 ‘ venant of God and the Seal of Baptism, appertaineth
 ‘ to thee and thy Children, &c.

Ans. 1. I answer, Children, I grant, are part of
 those Households where there are Children, but not of
 every Household, because there are many Households
 wherein there are no Children in non-age, and they
 can-

cannot be part of those Households, in which there is no Infant.

2. *Believe on the Lord Jesus and thou shalt be saved*; that is, do thou believe, and thy whole House that are capable to believe, let them believe also, and you shall all be saved; no more is intended, for according to your own argument, the Servants and Adult Children were under the same promise with his Infants, if he had any; now will you say that his Servants and Adult Children could be saved by his Faith, I tell you again, the Covenant of peculiarity God made with *Abraham's* natural Seed as such, was gone and abolished when *Paul* preached to the *Goatler*, and the Covenant of Grace or Covenant of Salvation God made with *Abraham*, I have proved appertained to none but the elect only, or his true Spiritual Seed.

3. Besides if the Parents believing brings the Children into the Covenant of Salvation; then it will follow, that the Parents non-believing keeps the Children out of the Covenant, and so hinders them of Salvation, and if so, the Children may be damn'd for their Parents Sin in not believing.

' You proceed and say, the Apostle planted the Church of the *Corinthians* by baptizing whole Households, *1 Cor. 1. 16, 17*, as the *House of Stephanas* and *Crispus*, and the *Jews* with one accord rose up against *Paul* at *Corinth*, and accused him that he *perswaded Men to worship God contrary to the Law*, verse 13. by how much the more would they have accused him, then (say you) for casting out their Children from the Covenant of *Abraham* if he had so done, &c.

Ans. I answer, how do you know but that might be one thing which they charged upon him, no doubt *Paul* according as *John Baptist* did, did declare, that their being the Children of *Abraham* according to the Flesh as such, now availed them nothing; he 'tis plain denyed their Childrens right to Circumcision, to give them a right to Baptism; he received none of them to Baptism who professed not their Faith in Christ, the Covenant of peculiarity with *Abraham's* natural Seed as such being abolished. Moreover *Paul* told these *Corinthians*

Corinthians, all things were now become anew; a new Church, and a new Church Membership, and a new right to that Church Membership, and now there is no knowing of Men after the Flesh, this Doctrine he preached to these Corinthians, 2 Cor. 5. 16. 17. and you force me to urge this matter often, wherefore henceforth know we no Man after the Flesh, yea, though we have known Christ after the Flesh, yet now henceforth know him no more, what doth the Apostle intend here by these words but this. viz. now henceforth or from the establishment of the dispensation of the Gospel, we know no Man after the Flesh; know, to know here, is to prefer or to esteem no Man above others, upon the account of their fleshly descent from Abraham in a lineal way by Generation, or in respect had to any Covenant God made with him or his fleshly Seed as such, that Covenant and Covenant right being taken away, he took away the first that he might establish the second, Heb. 10. 9. for the Priest-hood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the Law, Heb. 7. 12. there is therefore now no knowing or esteeming of Persons after that old Covenant manner, the new Covenant being quite different, or not according to the old, which run to Abraham's Fleshly Seed as such; they must now believe, and their Children must believe, before admitted as Members into the Gospel Church, therefore if any Man be in Christ, he is a new Creature, old things are passed away and all things are become new, 2 Cor. 5. 17. if any Person be grafted into Christ, or into the Gospel Church, he must have Faith and be a new Creature, or be of the New Creation as the Greek word holds forth; nay, (saith he) though we have known Christ after the Flesh, that is a Son of the Jewish Church, or esteemed him upon that account, Yet henceforth we know him, or prefer him in that respect no more; this was that Doctrine Paul preached, and 'tis very probable it was as much from hence that they charged him, for perswading Men contrary to the Law, as upon any other Consideration whatsoever; therefore all your flourish on this respect is vain, but since you make so great a stir about the baptizing of whole Households; I shall add something farther to clear up this Matter, and I argue thus, viz.

1. If there were no Families or Households, but in which there are some Infants; you might have some pretence for what you infer from hence; but how palpable is it, that there are every where many whole Families, in which there is no Infant or Child in non-age, and this being so, what certain Conclusion or Consequence can be drawn from hence?

2. Besides you know by a *Synecdoche*, a part is put for the whole, as *Isa.* 7. 2, 3, 8, 9. the Tribe of *Ephraim* is put for all *Israel*: 'tis said, all *Jerusalem* and *Judab* went out to be baptized by *John* in *Jordan*. In *1 Sam.* 1. 21. 22. the Text saith, *The Man Elkanah, and all his House went up to offer unto the Lord*, yet in the next Verse 'tis said expressly, *That Hannah and her Child Samuel went not up*; nay you have shewed us a Family or whole House that were said to bury the Body of *Sampson*, and yet you tell us the little Children were not included in that Expression, *all his House*.

3. As touching the *Goalers House*, 'tis positively said, *Paul preached to him, and to all that were in his House*, do you think he preached to his Infants (if he had any?) but to put the matter out of doubt, 'tis said *he rejoiced, believing in God with all his House*, as well as 'tis said, he was baptized and all his.

4. Touching *Lydia*, we say 'tis uncertain whether she was a *Maid, Widow or Wife*, but if she was Married and had Children; 'tis very unlikely (if Babes) that they were at that time with her, because she was far from her proper dwelling, nay many Miles from it, for she was of the City of *Thiatira*, verse 14. but when *Paul* preached to her, she was at *Philippi*, where she was Merchandizing, being a seller of Purple. Can we suppose she carried her little Babes so far to Market? Besides those of her House were called Brethren, who were baptized with her, therefore sure Children cannot be here meant; will you build your Practice of baptizing little Babes from such uncertain Conclusions, when 'tis doubtful whether she had any Children or no? Or if she had, whether they were with her at that time or not; our denying of it is as good as your affirming of it, yet 'tis plain she had Servants, or some who are called her Household, therefore what you say is impertinent upon this account.

And thus it appears to all impartial Persons, that there is nothing in this argument touching the practice of the Gospel Church; hears no mention made in baptizing whole Households of one Infant baptized, nor the least color of reason to conclude there were.

Mr. *Burkit* is so unreasonable as to put us upon searching the Scripture to prove a Negative, *i. e.* that there were none baptized in Infancy; we might as well have desired him to give proof that there never was any Infant ordained an Elder, or Pastor of a Church; or how can we prove they did not make use of *Honey* or *Oil* in Baptism, which some of the ancient Fathers used, as Mr. *Perkins* Notes, or *Salt* or *Spittle*, which practice is still in the *Romish Church*? Where is the extream unction forbid, or auricular Confession, or the use of Beads in Prayer, and a hundred more such *Romish* Fopperies? May these things be therefore done, because we read not that they are forbid, I thought adding to God's Word was forbidden, *Rev. 22.*

'But says Mr. *Burkit*, search the Scripture, and produce me any one instance if you can from the time of *St. John* the Baptist, to the time of *St. John* the Evangelist, which was more than threescore Years, during which time many Thousands of Infants were grown up to maturity, and make it appear there were not any baptized in their Infancy, or that their Baptism was deferred till riper years, or that there is any divine Command for the delaying the baptism of Children of Christian Parents, until they are grown up, and I will frankly yield the Cause. *Bravely spoken.*

Ans. I must retort this argument back again on him, and must say, it is a great argument against Infant Baptism, and not for it; for, say I, let it be considered, that since there was such a long space of time as 60 Years and more, between *John* Baptist and the Death of *John* the beloved Disciple, or *John* the Evangelist, during which time many Thousand, of Infants were born of baptized Believers, both of *Jews* and *Gentiles*, yet we read not of one Infant of them that was baptized.

Reader,

Reader, observe Mr. *Burkit*, says in the Gospel day, and when our Saviour sent his Disciples first to preach, they were to teach or make Disciples of those they baptized; but upon the Parents believing and being baptized, he says, their Children were admitted to Baptism also. Now say I, since many Parents thus taught and baptized, had multitudes of Infants born to them; how comes it about that we read not of one of their Infants that were baptized, no not from the time of *John* Baptist, to the Death of *John* the Evangelist? Can any Man think, had any Infants been baptized, that God would not have left some account of it, to put the matter out of doubt, especially since it was never taught Doctrinally nor Commanded? Certainly, it could not stand consistent with the Care, Wisdom and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, to have hid and concealed such a Practice, had there been one Infant by his Authority or Allowance baptized. But since the Scripture is silent in it, we may assure our Selves 'tis not the will of God, Infants should be baptized. Also if those who were to be baptized were first to be taught, were first to repent and believe, Then it follows clearly, that Baptism must be deferred till Children were of ripe Years, and able so to do, and did not *Mary* delay the baptizing of the Holy Child Jesus-

'As to the House of *Crispus*, you your self acknowledge, they all believed, these are your words, viz. it is true, all the House of *Crispus* were Believers, viz. Adult Persons, but say you, were all the Households of the Faithful Barren, &c.

Ans. No doubt but in some of those Households were Children, they might not be all Barren without Children, yet their Children might be grown up to maturity; but you your self have proved that whole Houses may be said to be baptized, and yet none but the Adult in those Households might be baptized, seeing the Scripture you quoted, saith, that *Samson* was buried by all his Fathers House, yet none of the little Children in that House could be concerned in that matter.

As to the House of *Stephanas* you say well, they are called the first Fruits of *Achaia*. I beseech you Bre-

thren, ye know the Household of Stephanas, that is the first Fruits of Achaia, and that they have addicted themselves to the ministry of the Saints, 1 Cor. 16. 15. that you submit your selves to such, vers. 16.

Ans. They, that is the whole Household gave themselves up to administer to the Saints, but before little Babes could not do that, nor ought the Adult to submit themselves to little Children, or esteem and reverence them for acts of Charity.

You bring in this Objection, viz. 'we do not read 'of any Infant that were in those Households, to which 'you answer, if the Households of the *Corinthians* when 'the Apostle baptized them were so barren, what need 'had the Apostle to write unto them that their Children were holy, 1 Cor. 7. 14. it is more than probable, that Children were in every Household that was 'baptized.

Ans. Now you go over again with your former argument, and repeat the same things which I have again and again answer'd, about the Childs being in Covenant, after the Head of the Family or the Parents do believe.

2. I say, 'tis very probable there might be no Children in non-age in those Households, because 'tis said, the whole House had believed.

3. If there were yet by your own grant, all the House might be said to be baptized, and yet no little Children baptized that might be in those Households, because *all* is often taken but for a part.

4. But will you said I build an Ordinance upon a probability and on uncertain Consequences; nay one of the sacred Institutions of the Gospel, called one of the two great Sacraments thereof; that Text, 1 Cor. 7. 14. we have already answered. Now from the whole, we shall draw Conclusions in opposition to yours.

1. That the Covenant that God made with *Noah* and his Family, was a Covenant made with all the World, and so not the Covenant of Grace, though there was Mercy and Grace contained in it to all Mankind, and to the Fowls of the Air, and Beasts of the Field also.

2. That

2. That God's taking all *Abraham's* Family or Household into Covenant as such, it was only a Covenant that peculiarly appertained to his natural Seed, and it had many Temporal Blessings and Privileges attending it, which no Household under the Gospel can pretend unto, and of this Covenant Circumcision was a sign, and that Circumcision was only given to be a *Seal of the righteousness of Faith* to *Abraham* only, and not to little Children.

3. That the whole House of *Israel* as such, or the whole Nation of the *Jews*, under the Law were all as so considered then, the Church of God, and that the Gospel Church consisteth not of whole Households or any one whole Nation, it being not of an National Constitution, but Congregational only, consisting of none but of believers, baptized upon the profession of their Faith who are called the *Household of Faith*.

4. That the whole House of *Israel* was a typical Church, who were holy with a *Ceremonial* and *Typical Holiness*, signifying that all the Members of the Gospel Church, should be spiritually and savingly Holy.

5. That God in the Gospel times, (though now and then he is pleased to call by his Grace, all or the greatest part of whole Families, yet contrary to the old Covenant) he usually now takes but two of a City and one of a Family, and brings them into his true Gospel *Sin*.

6. That the first Churches were only planted of such that believed, some out of one Family, and some out of other Families, and that out of the *Jewish* Church, and such that were called of the Gentile Nations.

7. That the Parents Faith saves none of his Household, either Children or Servants, nor gives them any right to Gospel Baptism.

8. Lastly, one would think these things to be clear enough to give Satisfaction to all that desire Satisfaction about Infant Baptism, and that there is not the least shadow of proof for it from what our Brethren argue, from whole Families who were said to be baptized, if we compare Scripture with Scripture, for as we find, no Precept nor Example for Infant Baptism, so not any Consequence

for it, that is naturally drawn from any Text of Holy Scripture, to which the Pedo-Baptists do refer,

C H A P. XVII.

Proving that Children ought not to be Baptized, because they were baptized in divers Centuries or Ages under the Apostacy of the Church, when most of Christs Institutions were corrupted; wherein it is also proved, that for the two first Hundred Years after Christ, no Infants were baptized, containing an Answer to Mr. James Owen's 14 Chapter and II Argument, to prove Infant Baptism.

‘**T**HUS Mr. Owen begins in his 14th Chapter of his Book, viz. the Children of the Faithful were baptized in every Age of the Church of God since the Apostles time until this latter Age, as I can prove at large if it were profitable for the unlearned Reader, I shall set down some Examples.

Ans. 8. Your argument is, that Children ought to be baptized, because they were baptized in every age of the Church since the Apostles time.

Ans. 1. Give one Instance if you can, out of approved History, of one Infant baptized in the first or second Century, but pass by Two or Three Hundred Years after Christ, and many errors besides this of Infant Baptism crept amain into the Churches. But pray remember, now you are without Book, you are forced to quit the *Holy Bible*, the *Sacred History*, and *great Charter of the Church*; and therefore all your proof out of *Humane History*, which may be true, or may not be true, signifies nothing. But you had best take heed, lest we carry the cause against you here too,

i. e.,

i. e. for the first Centuries; we will examine your Authors and humane Testimonies.

The first is *Calvin* a latter Writer, I know not but *Ireneus* and *Cyprian* might be both had out of him: I do confess, *Ireneus* lived not above Two Hundred Years after Christ; or in the second Century, thus he and many others cite him, *viz. Omnes venit Christus per semet ipsum salvare, omnes qui per eum renascuntur ad Deum Infantes, & parvulos Juniores & Seniores.* In English thus: Christ Jesus came to save all by himself, all who by him are born again unto God, Infants and little ones, Young and Old.

Ans. Reader, pray observe, here is not a word of one Infant baptized; but this Man infers it from his Words, so that we have nothing but Consequences, neither from God's Word, nor the words of Man. Christ, no doubt, came to save some of all sorts of Men, and who doubts but he came to save Infants, and little ones, Young and Old? But why must these Words [*who are born again*] be applyed to Infant Baptism. The scope of *Ireneus* in that Chapter, is to refute the Gnosticks, who said that Christ did not exceed One and Thirty Years of age; against whom *Ireneus* alledged that Christ lived in every age, *i. e.* of Infancy, Youth, and old Age, that by his Age and Example he might sanctifie every age. So that here *Ireneus* speaks not of being born again in Baptism; for he saith, *Omnes inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum; i. e.* I say, all which are born again by him to God, *i. e.* by Christ, not as if he had baptized Infants, but because he (*i. e.* Christ) was an Infant, that by the example or virtue of his Age, he might sanctifie Infants, as the whole Discourse in Latin plainly shews, *viz. Magister ergo existens, Magistri quoque habebat etatem, non reprobans, nec super grediens hominem, neque solvens suam legem in se humani generis, sed omnem etatem sanctificans per illam, &c.*

2. As to *Cyprian*, he lived as I find it in History, about 248 or 300 Years after Christ; and should I tell the Reader what Corruptions and Errors were let in about that time, he would not wonder to hear Infants were allowed Baptism: Yet we have *Cyprian* against *Cyprian*. It is true, as far as I can gather in his time,

Infant Baptism was first introduced, without any Ground or Warrant from Christ; and it was as strongly opposed, which appears by the Debates and Doubts about it.

3. The third humane Authority that is brought by Mr. Burkit, is that cursed decree of the Milevetan Council, that all who denyed Infant Baptism should be *Anathema*, accursed. If he comes but a little lower, he hath proof enough in the *Popish Councils, Decrees and Canons*. But 'tis to be observed, that those Fathers pleaded for Infant Baptism, as that which took away Original Sin, and gave Children the Eucharist too, in the first Sacrament abusing that Text, *John 3. 5.* and in the other, that in *John 6. 53.* These are all the humane Proofs from the Churches, after the primitive Apostolical days which Mr. Burkit brought, and I doubt not but to give better and more Authentick Authors of the ancient Fathers against Infant Baptism, than hath been brought for it, and some of them nearer the Apostles days too. The first is *Justin Martyr*; though I have him not, yet take his Words, as they are cited by Mr. *Richard Baxters Saints Rest*, Chap. 8. Sect. 5. I will declare unto you, how we offer up our selves unto God, after that we are renewed through Christ, those amongst us that are instructed in the Faith, and believe that which we teach them is true, being willing to live according to the same, We do admonish them to fast and pray for forgiveness of Sinns, and we also pray with them, and when they are brought by us into the Water, and there as we were new born, are they also by the new Birth received, and then in calling upon God the Father, the Lord Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost, they are washed in Water, &c. the Food we call the Eucharist, to which no Man is admitted, but only he that believeth the Truth of the Doctrine, being washed in the laver of Regeneration for Remission of Sinns, and so liveth as Christ hath taught, this you see, saith Mr. Baxter, is no new way.

4. You cite *Origen*, who was you say famous in the year 230, who saith, in *Hom. 8 in Levit. de Infantibus baptizandis Ecclesia traditionem accepit ab Apostolis*, the Church received infant Baptism by Tradition from the Apostles, we have proved you say, before this was a Scripture Tradition, for the Apostles baptized little Children.

Ans. We

Ans. We may cite Origen against Origen, so little credit is to be given to History in this case about him, and some other of the Fathers, for I find *Origen* saith, viz. they that are rightly baptized are washed unto Salvation, but so was not *Simon Magus*, he that is baptized unto Salvation, receives the Water and the Holy Ghost, which *Simon* did not but Water only, *Rom.* 6. upon *Ezek.* 36. v. 4. *Mountainus*, p. 36. 37. and in his Commentary upon *Rom.* 6. saith the same *Origen*, such Baptism that was accompanied with crucifying the Flesh, and rising again to newness of Life, was the approved Baptism; I must confess that *Dr. Taylor* saith, that *Origen* and *Austin* are the only Witnesses that asserted Infant Baptism to be an Apostolical Tradition; but it appears by *Erasmus*, that *Origen's* writings were greatly corrupted by *Ruffinus*, and made to speak sometimes for Infant Baptism. See *Jacob Mercurgus*, p. 283. 291. and *Mountainus* p. 29. to 35, 42, 43. Sir, had you proved Infant Baptism from the Scripture, and that the Apostles baptized Infants, you need not go to Humane History that is so uncertain, and no Rule for us.

5. *Gregory of Nazianzum*, who you say was famous about the year 370, beareth witness for Infant Baptism; saith he, *omni aetati Baptisma convenit*, Baptism is answerable unto every Age. And again, *da infantis custodiam*, give Infants the Baptism of the Trinity, and that will be a great and excellent Guard unto them.

Ans. I find a worthy Author that quotes this *Gregory* speaking quite the contrary thing; in his third Oration, (saith he) the baptized used in the first place to confess their Sins, and to renounce the Devil and all his Works before many Witnesses, and that none were baptized of old, but they that did confess their Sins, and how dangerous it was headlong, and without due Preparation to partake thereof. He therefore adviseth, that the Baptism of Infants be deferred till they did not only make Confession of their Faith, but were to desire the same, see *Dr. Taylor*, p. 239. Now worthy *Britains*, what signifyeth the citing of such Fathers, when we cannot be certain that we have their true writings; God hath preserved his sacred Word from Corruption,

ruption, but not the Humane History of the Fathers.

2. But should this Father and St. *Austine*, and others that followed them, be for Infant Baptism, what will this avail the asserters of Infant Baptism, seeing the Church was before their times so greatly corrupted, and many grand Errors brought in; the Tradition of *God Fathers and God Mothers*, one of the Church of *England* hath lately shewed to be near as early in the Church as Infant baptism, which Mr. *Owen* will not therefore receive to be an Apostolical Tradition.

3. We readily grant, that Infant baptism is of great Antiquity, of more then Thirteen Hundred years standing, so are many other abominable Errors, Practices and corrupt Ceremonies; *but from the beginning it was not so*, viz. 'tis not to be found in Holy Scripture, it is none of Christs Institution; therefore an *Human* Invention; nor was it practised in the *Two first hundred years after Christ*, as I shall now prove out of as good Authors, as any Mr. *Owen* hath or can produce.

1. 'Tis said *Justin Martyr* was Converted about 30 years after the Apostle *John*; and by the Order then used in the Church, It appears there was no Infant baptism thought of.

Walafrid Strabo, as I find him cited by a great Historian, says, that there was no Children, *but aged and understanding Persons* Baptized in this Age; that is to say in the Second Century. *Wal. Strabo. Eccl. Hist. cap. 26. Vicecom. l. 1. c. 30.*

Tertullian in his Book of Baptism speaking of that Text: *Suffer little Children to come unto me*, saith he, 'Indeed the Lord said, do not hinder them to come unto me. Let them come therefore while they grow to Years, and while come, let them be Taught; let them become Christians when they are able to know Christ. Why doth Innocent Age hasten to the Remission of Sins? Men will deal more warily in Worldly affairs: So that they who are not trusted with an Earthly Inheritance, are trusted with an Heavenly one: Let them ask for Salvation, that thou mayest appear to have given it to them.

‘ Dr. *Taylor* saith, that the Truth of the business is,
 ‘ as there is no Command of Scripture to oblige Chil-
 ‘ dren to the susception of it ; so the necessity of Pedo-
 ‘ Baptism was not determined in the Church, till the
 ‘ Canons that was made in the *Milevitan Council*, a pro-
 ‘ vincial in *Africa*, never till then. I grant, (saith he)
 ‘ it was practised in *Africa* before that time, and they,
 ‘ or some of them thought well of it. And though
 ‘ that is no argument for us to think so, yet none of
 ‘ them ever pretended it to be necessary, nor to have
 ‘ been a precept of the Gospel. St. *Austin* was the
 ‘ first that ever preached it to be necessary, and it was
 ‘ in his Heat and Anger against *Pelagius*. Thus Dr.
 ‘ *Taylor*.

Ignatius in his Discourse about Baptism asserts, that
 it ought to be accompanied with Faith, Love, and Pa-
 ‘ tience after Preaching. *H. Montanus* p. 45. and *Fa-*
 ‘ ‘ *cob Dubois*, p. 16. to 22. and *Dutch Martyrology*, where
 ‘ *Ignatius’s* Letters are mentioned to *Polycarp, Tralensis* to
 ‘ them of *Philadelphia*.

Dr. *Taylor* saith in his Disswasive against Popery, p.
 118. printed 1667, one of his last pieces, Thus, viz.
 ‘ That there is a Tradition to baptize Infants, relies
 ‘ but upon two Witnesses, *Origen* and *Austin*, and the
 ‘ latter having it from the former, it lies upon a sin-
 ‘ gle Testimony, which (saith he) is a pittiful argu-
 ‘ ment to prove a Tradition Apostolical. He is the
 ‘ first that spoke of it ; but *Tertullian*, that was before
 ‘ him, seems to speak against it, which he would not
 ‘ have done, if it had been an Apostolical Tradition ;
 ‘ and that it was not so, is but too certain, if there be
 ‘ any Truth in the Words of *Ludovicus Vives*, who
 ‘ says, that anciently none were baptized, but Persons
 ‘ of ripe Age.

Great *Basil* in his Book of the *Holy Spirit*, Cap. 12.
 saith. ‘ Faith and Baptism are the two means of Salva-
 ‘ tion inseparably cleaving together, for Faith is not per-
 ‘ fected by Baptism, but Baptism is founded by Faith, and
 ‘ by the same Name both things are fulfilled ; for as we
 ‘ believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, so also we are
 ‘ baptized in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy
 ‘ Spirit ; and indeed there goeth before a Confession,
 ‘ leading

‘leading us to Salvation ; but Baptism followeth, sealing our Confession and Covenant.

The same Churches Teacher (saith the learned Dr. *Du-Veil*) in his Third Book against *Eunomius*, speaketh thus, viz. ‘Baptism is the Seal of Faith, Faith is the ‘Confession of the Godhead ; it is necessary we should ‘first Believe, and then be sealed in Baptism. *Du-Veil*, *Acts*, c. 8. p. 278.

Zonaras saith, ‘the Babe will then need Baptism when ‘it can chuse it.

Gregory Nazianzen in his Fourth Oration, saith Dr. *Du-Veil*, Of those who dye without Baptism, gives us ‘an Instance in those to whom Baptism was not administered by reason of Infancy. And the same *Nazianzen*, ‘though he was a Bishops Son, being a long time bred ‘up under his Fathers care, was not, saith the said Dr., ‘baptized till he came to Man’s Age. In like manner ‘(saith he) *Basil* the Great that was born of devout Parents, and instructed from his Childhood, was not baptized until a Man, p. 280. Also, saith he, *John* of *Antioch*, ‘called afterwards *Chrysostom*, was born of Christian ‘Parents, as the truer Opinion is, tutored by the famous ‘Bishop *Miletius*, was not yet baptized, till he was One ‘and Twenty Years of Age.

‘*Hierom*, also *Ambrose* and *Austir*, who were born ‘of Christian Parents, and consecrated to Christian ‘Discipline, even from their Childhood, were not baptized before thirty years of age, as Dr. *Taylor* Bishop ‘of *Down* asserts in his Twelfth Section of the Life of ‘Christ.

Now, Sir. here are Examples enough that do prove in the primitive times, Children of baptized Believers were not baptized, but had their Baptism delayed till they themselves believed, and gave an account of their Faith. Had it been the constant custom of the Godly to baptize Infants, would not these, think you, have been in their Infancy baptized ?

Grotius, as I find him quoted by Dr. *Du-Veil*, saith, ‘The Primitive Churches did not baptize Infants, see ‘*Grotius*’s Notes on the Gospel.

‘Nay,

‘ Nay, (saith the same great and learned Author,) it doth most plainly appear by the right of baptizing in the *Romish Church*, for baptism is to be asked before the Person to be baptized do enter into the Church, which the *surety does in the Infants Name*, a clear distinct confession of Faith is required, which the same surety rehearseth in the Infants Name, *i. e.* a *Renouncing of the World, its Poms, the Flesh, and the Devil*. We may by this perceive from whence the *Original of our old Church Catechism came*. But this is a clear Argument, saith the Dr. to prove of old, the Persons who were to be baptized, themselves asked Baptism in their own Name, and of their own choice, and professed their own Faith.

In the *Neo-Cesarean Council* it was framed thus. ‘ As to those who are big with Child, they ought to be baptized when they will, for in this Sacrament there is nothing common to her that brings forth, and that which shall be brought forth from her Womb, because in that Confession, the Liberty of every ones Choice is declared.

Whence we may infer, 1. That in that age, there seemed to be that averfness from baptizing Children, that they were not willing to admit Women great with Child to Baptism, lest it should be thought that the Child was baptized with them.

2. That in those times in the Confession of Faith, in the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Christ, which was done in a Publick and Solemn manner in their Baptism, a liberty of Choice and Consent was required as preparatory to it; for the incapacity of the Infant in the Womb, to declare this Choice and Consent, is the reason why they conclude that the Infant was not baptized with the Mother.

3. That it was then judg’d necessary to have the Consent and Choice of those who were to be baptized.

Dr. *Du-Veil*, citing the same Synod on this passage (*viz. that concerning the Baptism of a Woman with Child, that her Baptism concerns not her Child, for every one is to give a demonstration of his own Faith and Confession*) saith, ‘ however the interpreters draw it to another purpose; it does appear that the Question was

‘ was made of a Woman big with Child, because it did
 ‘ seem that the Child was baptized together with the
 ‘ Mother, which notwithstanding ought not to be used,
 ‘ nor to be baptized, except of its own proper Election
 ‘ and Profession.

Dr. Barlow, Late Bishop of *Lincoln*, in his Letter to
 Mr. T. saith, ‘ I believe there is neither Precept nor
 ‘ Example in the Scripture for Pedit-Baptism, nor any
 ‘ just Evidence for it, for above 200 Years after Christ.
 ‘ *Tertullian* condemns it as an unwarrantable Custom,
 ‘ and *Nazianzen* a good while after dislikes it: Sure I
 ‘ am, (saith he) that in the primitive times they were
 ‘ *Catechumeni*, then *Illuminati* or *Baptizati*, and that not
 ‘ only *Pagans*, and Children of *Pagans* Converted, but
 ‘ Children of Christian Parents. The Truth is, I do
 ‘ believe Pedit-Baptism, how or by whom I know not,
 ‘ came into the World in the second Century, and in
 ‘ the third and fourth began to be practised, though not
 ‘ generally, and was defended as lawful from the Text,
 ‘ *John* 3. 5. grossly misunderstanding it, upon the like
 ‘ mistake. *John* 6. 53. they did for many Centuries both
 ‘ in the Greek and Latin Church Communicate In-
 ‘ fants, and gave them the Lord’s Supper; and I con-
 ‘ fess, they might do both as well as either, &c. Thus
 ‘ Bishop Barlow.

Curcellus saith, ‘ *Pedit-Baptismus duobus primis a Christo*
 ‘ *nato seculis fuit incognitus*, &c. Pedit Baptism was un-
 ‘ known in the two first Ages after Christ, but in the
 ‘ third and fourth it was approved of by a few; in the
 ‘ fifth and following Ages it began to be generally re-
 ‘ ceived. And therefore (as afterwards he saith) the
 ‘ right is indeed observed by us as an ancient Custom,
 ‘ but not as an Apostolical Tradition.

‘ The same learned Author, saith, *De peccato Orig.*
 ‘ *Numb.* 80. saith *Morem Infantes Baptizandi non capisse*
 ‘ *a te tertium nato Seculum*, &c. That the custom of
 ‘ baptizing infants, did not begin till the Third Age
 ‘ after Christ, but in the two former no footsteps of it
 ‘ appear. And afterwards saith *Sine ipsius [Christi]*
 ‘ *mandato introducta est*; it was introduced without the
 ‘ command of Christ.

Athanasius in sermone 3 contra Arianos, saith, our Saviour did not slightly command to baptize, but first of all said, Teach and then Baptize, that true Faith might come by teaching, and Baptism be perfected by Faith.

Haimo in Postilla upon the Text, *Go teach all Nations*, Fol. 278. In this place, (saith he) is set down a Rule rightly how to baptize, that is, that Teaching should go before Baptism; for he saith, *teach* all Nations, and then he saith, and baptize them, for he that is to be baptized, must be before instructed; that he first learn to believe that which in Baptism he shall receive; for as Faith without works is Dead, so Works when they are not of Faith, are nothing worth.

Idem in Annatationibus in mar. The Apostles were commanded first to Teach and then to baptize: The Jews were brought by Ceremonies to the Knowledge of the Truth, but Christians must learn to know them first.

Beda saith, 'all those that came to the Apostles to be baptized, were instructed and taught concerning the Sacrament of Baptism, then they received the Holy Administration thereof.

Rabanus, the Catechi, which is the Doctrine of Faith, must go before Baptism, to the intent that he that is to be baptized, (*i. e. Catechamenus*) may first learn the Mysteries of Faith.

Arnobius, Thou art not first (saith he) baptized, and then beginnest to effect and embrace the Faith; but when thou art to be baptized, thou signify unto the Priest what thy desire is, and makest thy Confession with thy Mouth.

Ferom upon *Matt.* saith, 'The Lord commandeth his Apostles that they should first *instruct and teach all Nations*, and afterwards should baptize those that were instructed into the Mysteries of the Faith; for it cannot be, (saith he) that the Body should receive the Sacrament of Baptism, till the Soul have received the true Faith.

Sir, What think you now of the Testimony of the ancient Fathers, and of the practice of the Churches after the Apostles days? Sure the Reader must needs con-

conclude, we have the advantage here too, and you must yield whether you will or no, and give up the Controversie.

But to proceed, ' Your first Demonstration to prove ' Infant Baptism in the days after the Apostles is this, ' viz. because that Children had Hands laid upon them ' in their Minority.

Ans. This signifies nothing, for as the Fathers changed the Ordinance of Baptism from believing Men and Women to ignorant Babes, so they changed imposition of Hands (which I own to be a principle of Christ's Doctrine, *Heb. 6. 12*) to such young People, who in their Minority had learned the Articles of the Christian Faith. But clear it is, in the primitive Apostolical times, none but baptized Believers were admitted to that Ordinance of *laying on of Hands*, as *Acts 8. 14.* and *19. 6.*

But your Brother Mr. *Burkit* acknowledgeth, *that formerly there were such called Catechumeni, Persons taught or instructed, and afterwards baptized.*

He saith further, *that there were two sorts*, the last he brings for his purpose, but I know not where he hath his Testimony, and therefore pass it by.

So much to your first Demonstration from the Fathers.

Your second Demonstration to prove Infant Baptism is this, *viz.* ' because in the primitive times Infants ' were admitted to the Lord's Supper, therefore you conclude they were admitted to Baptism.

Ans. And they had (say I) as much Ground for the one as for the other, and there is the same parity of reason to conclude, as they erred in one, so they did in the other.

Why doth you not from hence give Infants also the Lord's Supper? The Reason you give I have before proved insignificant.

As to his third Demonstration, it is not denied but that Infant Baptism was received in the Church in the third and fourth Century, with many other Poperies, but that doth him no kindness; the Church was adulterated from the true Apostolical Faith and Practice, in many Respects in those and after times downwards.

His fourth Demonstration is this, *viz.* " If it was a gross Error in the Primitive Fathers to admit Infants to Baptism, then they in suffering such an Error to pass uncensured and uncondemned, were guilty of the greatest Impiety, &c.

Ans. What then ? I ask him and you, or any other of our Opposers, whether ye do not believe for several Centuries those Fathers who admitted Infants to the Lord's Supper without censuring or condemning it, were not guilty also of as great Impurity ? Besides, did not the same Fathers hold other Errors ? See Mr. Perkins *Demonst. of the Problem*, pag. 488. These are his Words, *viz.* " And whereas some Fathers, *viz.* *Ireneus, Justin, Clement, Tertullian*, held that the Law of Nature had power to save the Gentiles without Christ. And again he saith, " The Fathers have Errors, yea and sometimes gross ones. Doth not History tell us the Fathers used other Rites also, and that in Baptism ? See Perkins, p. 549. The Fathers, saith he, used some other Rites and Ceremonies which are now omitted, as *Kissing of the Child*, which was baptized, In *Cyprian*, l. 3. ep. 8. use of Milk and Honey, use of Milk and Wine, *Hierom* in *Is. c. 55*. It was an use for the Baptizer to blow in the Face of the Baptized ; and the Party baptized used to Exufflate the Devil, whom he renounced. What Credit is to be given to such Fathers ?

Mr. Owen saith, " That Infant-Baptism was so generally in the Church of God, that the *Pelagians* could not deny it, tho they denied Original Sin, against the which it was a Medicine. And that *Bernard*, who lived between the Year 1091, and the Year 1153, declareth it was the Practice of the Church in those Ages.

Ans. We deny not, but readily grant, that the Baptism of Infants was in the Church long before that time : And remarkable 'tis, that about 1091 or 1100, Popish Darkness was at its greatest height. And was it any wonder those Fathers gave Baptism to Infants when it was the Practice of those times before *Bernard*, to give Infants the Lord's Supper also, as well as Baptism ? Which Mr. Owen knows well enough, if he hath read any thing of History.

2. *Bernard*, Mr. Owen saith, " Censur'd those who opposed Infant-Baptism, &c.

1. From whence it appears there were some Christians who opposed Infant-Baptism even in the darkeſt time of *Papery*.

2. What Wonder is it to hear that ſuch in thoſe corrupt times, who deny'd Infant-Baptiſm, were cenſured, when we who do deny it now, are ſo unrighteouſly cenſured by you and your Brethren, notwithſtanding ſuch clear Light in theſe days is broken forth?

Mr. *Owen* alſo endeavourerh to prove, that the *Waldenſes* were for Infant-Baptiſm.

And he ſeems to charge Mr. *Tombs* and Mr. *Danvers* for aſſerting the contrary.

Anſw. To which I anſwer; I ſee no reaſon why he ſhould condemn Mr. *Tombs* or Mr. *Danvers* in this matter; for according to ſome Hiſtories it appears, that the *Antient Waldenſes* and *Albigenſes*, as alſo the *Antient Britains*, were for the Baptizing of Believers: ſee D. *Balthazar Lidiuſ*, in his Hiſtory of the Church, p. 2. col. 2. out of *Renarius*, and G. *Bildas*. in his Book called *De Hiſtoria Aurelii Ambroſii*.

And the Learned *Uſher*, in his Book of the State of the Chriſtian Church, as Mr. *Danvers* obſerves, p. 237. ſhews, that they defended Believers-Baptiſm in oppoſition to that of Infants: ſee *Moreland*, Book 1. c. 4. p. 67. yet no doubt but ſome of the *Waldenſes* might be for Infant-Baptiſm. Yet Mr. *Owen* confeſſeth that *Bernard* acknowledgeth that Hiſtory doth ſpeak of the *Waldenſes* denying Infant-Baptiſm, tho he would fain have it from what the ſaid *Bernard* ſaith, to be a Slander caſt upon them by their Enemies the *Papiſts*. Let it be how it will concerning them, know, Noble *Britains*, that we build not our Faith about Baptiſm upon the Practice and Cuſtom of Men, Fathers, General Councils, Proteſtant Reformers or Churches; but upon the Word of God.

To conclude with this Argument: From hence we infer, that the practice of the Church under the Romiſh Apoſtacy of Infant-Baptiſm, in every Age, ſince the firſt Centuries unto theſe Times, is no good Proof for it. What tho *Calvin* and *Luther*, two famous Proteſtant Reformers, and many other Modern Divines were, and many Godly and Learned Men are now for this Tradition; Muſt it be therefore a Truth? Muſt our Faith ſtand in the Wiſdom of Men in this matter, or in the Power of God, and in the Authority of His Sacred Word? Our firſt *Proteſtant Reformers* were raiſed

up to restore those Grand Fundamentals of Faith, more than to reform Matters of Discipline, and about this Rite of Infant-Baptism and some other Ceremonies. *The Path of the Just is as a shining Light, that shines more and more to the perfect Day, Prov. 4. 18.*

" You hint, that not one questioned the Privilege of Children to Baptism, until the Adversary came while Men slept, and sowed Tares among the Wheat.

Ans. Sir, you mistake, it was *while Men slept* that the Enemy first sowed the evil Seed of *Babes-Baptism* in the Church. Moreover, the Baptism of Believers, in opposition to Infant-Baptism, I have proved is no part of those Tares the Adversary hath sowed, but it is Seed which Jesus Christ himself sowed, or 'tis (I mean) his own holy Institution.

" You tell us a Story of one *John Smith*, a Minister of the Church of *England*, who went into *Holland*, and united with the Church of one *Mr. Ainsworth*, and in the end being cast out of the Church, he baptized himself, and then rebaptized others.

Ans. I could tell you of many evil and foul things and practices done by some *Presbyterians*, but should I brand the whole *Brotherhood* from thence? Do you not shew an evil and detracting Tongue, by casting such *Odiurns* upon the whole Body of gracious Christians, falsely called *Anabaptists*: For we are not for Rebaptizing, or Baptizing again such who have been truly and rightly Baptized, that were the proper Subjects of that holy Ordinance.

2. But may be this may be a *false Story* too, and wrote in prejudice by such who loved not the practice of baptizing of Believers, nor the People who so practise.

For what need had he to baptize himself, were there none called *Anabaptists* in *Holland* nor *Germany* before that time? 'tis much we have not the *Munster Story* of *John of Leydon*. I perceive you have malice enough against us, the Lord give you Repentance if it be his Will.

C H A P. XVIII.

Shewing that Infant Baptism is no excellent way or means to plant the Christian Religion, but a sinful thing; and therefore in opposition to what Mr. James Owen saith, They ought not to be baptized: being an Answer to what he hath wrote in his 15th Chapter, and twelfth and last Argument.

“ **Y** O U say, *Infant Baptism* is an excellent means
 “ which God hath ordained for to plant and con-
 “ tinue the Church of God: Christ thus commanded
 “ his Apostles to gather Churches among the *Gentiles*, by
 “ teaching and baptizing them in the Name of the Father,
 “ &c. Mat. 28. 29.

Ans. I answer: The way it appears that Christ com-
 manded his Apostles to gather Churches among the *Gentiles*,
 is first to teach them, and then baptize them; you say right
 whilst you repeat the Text, but God hath not commanded
 to baptize Infants, and that way to plant his Church.

“ You add, It is an excellent means for this end, making
 “ Children to be Disciples of Christ; let none marvel at
 “ this, because Infants are of the number of Disciples:
 “ *Acts 15. 11. Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke on the*
 “ *necks of the Disciples?* Those Disciples were, say you, the
 “ Faithful and their Seed.

Ans. This is not true: The Disciples, in the Text you cite,
 refer only to Believers among the *Gentiles*; those false
 Teachers would have the Brethren be circumcised, and they
 were they only that are called Disciples.

These Brethren being *Gentiles*, were never circumcised;
 and therefore these false Teachers taught them so to be, see
Acts 15. 1.

2. Sir, I will appeal to your Conscience in this matter, Is not a Disciple one that is taught or instructed, and can Infants be called Disciples, who are not capable of being taught?

Mr. Baxter saith, *Such that are made Disciples by teaching, are the Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission*; and he is in the right.

3. Doth the baptizing of Infants make them Disciples? Doth Christ say baptize, and so make them Disciples? Or is it not, make Disciples, and baptize them? *Mathetufate*, disciplize, and then it follows, baptize them.

"You say, Christ knoweth how to administer a secret Doctrine to Infants, according to his promise, *Thy Children shall be all taught of the Lord*.

Ans. 1. No doubt but Christ is able to do it: But doth he in a secret way administer Instruction to Infants? prove it, and also how you come to know it; for they must be known Disciples, visible Disciples that are to be baptized.

2. Are they little Infants that Promise refers to, *i. e. Thy Children shall be all taught of God*? They are *Sion's Children*, or such that are born of God that are under that Promise, not Infants, or our Children as such; for are all Believers natural Offspring taught of God when Babes, (or adult either?) O abominable abuse of the holy Text!

"Baptism (say you) setteth little Children under a particular obligation to be the Lord's; doubtless they can receive such an obligation now as formerly they did, *Deut. 29. 11, 12.* And it is as certain that this Bond is a great advantage to make them willing when they come to age, God hath presented them by the Grace of his Covenant, &c.

Ans. 1. 'Tis you pretend to lay them under an obligation, but not by Christ's authority, prove he hath commanded you so to do.

2. Doth Baptism confer Grace? you seem to assert this, for else how hath God by Baptism prevented them? Your sprinkling them with water doth not, cannot prevent them. I affirm therefore 'tis an obligation of man's devising, for you cannot prove it is of God's appointment; therefore to refuse to bring them under such an obligation is no *fantastick* thing, as you intimate it is. You say *the mark of the Spirit is upon them*.

Ans. Baptism is no mark of the Spirit to any, but to such who have the Spirit; and what a *Mock-Baptism* is it to give the Sign, where appears no demonstration of the thing thereby signified?

“(You say) on the other side, Satan hath not such an advantage against those that are baptized in their Infancy.”

Ans. How doth it appear that Satan hath not such an advantage against your Children (as he hath against ours that were never baptized, as you call *Rantism*) I am sure our Children generally are as sober, and helped to escape Satan's snares as far forth as yours generally are. Will God own or bless an humane Tradition? The Woman that *Luther* mentioned, no doubt might think she was obliged to fear God by that sort of Baptism she had when she was an Infant, yet God never obliged her to come under that obligation, but may be she was baptized when a Believer.

However the *Papists* may argue for their voluntary Vows after the same manner, viz. it is a great help and an advantage to them to preserve them from sin, and temptations of the Devil.

“ Infant-Baptism is an excellent means (you say) to plant the true Religion, and to continue the Church, by giving an advantage for the Ministers of the Gospel to reason with such when they come to age, far better than they can with those that are not baptized, that they might call them to remembrance of their baptismal Vow, &c.”

Ans. This is certainly a grand mistake; for instead of its being an advantage to Ministers to reason with such that were baptized in their Infancy, to remember their baptismal Vow, and so to believe and turn to God, 'tis apparent it may hinder them; for if those persons when grown up, do call to remembrance what you *Pedobaptists* have taught and told them, touching those Blessings and Privileges they then received, it may rather take them off from seeking after either Faith or Repentance.

1. For you tell them when their Parents believed, and were saved, they were made partakers of the same Privilege and Blessing also; if so, what need they concern themselves about getting personal Faith? you believe and teach them the Doctrine of final Perseverance; no doubt such who are in a state of Grace, can never finally fall out of it.

2. The

2. The Obligation and Vow that lies upon baptized persons according to the Scripture, is not that they seek after Regeneration, no, for it necessarily supposeth that they had that before baptized; but it doth bind or oblige them to persevere in Holiness, that as they have been buried in Baptism, as persons *dead to sin*, so they should walk in *newness of life*, Rom. 6. 3, 4. Now you would have your Baptism to oblige your baptized Children to become dead to sin, they were not it appears dead when buried with Christ in Baptism, but you bury them alive, (if you baptized them.) To shew them they must die, Sir, God never ordained Baptism to such an end, or to oblige persons thus to do, see Rom. 6. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. Col. 1. 12, 13.

3. The Church of England saith, *That the Child which they baptize is thereby (that is in Baptism) regenerated, and made a Child of God, a Member of Christ, and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven.* And what you say implies as much; for it must needs be thus, if when the Parents believe and are regenerated and saved, the Child partakes of the same privilege, then the Child believed and was regenerated, and saved also. Now if this be so, what advantage can Ministers have from the Consideration of Infants Baptism to press Regeneration, or the Performance of Repentance upon them when they come to age, above what we have to press these great Duties upon our Children, when grown up that never were baptized? What need is there to press that on the Consciences of your Children when they come to age, which they had wrought in them when they were in their Infancy? No, your Work is rather to press them as Saints and renewed Persons, to live holy Lives, and improve those Divine Habits which they received when their Parents believed, or those inspired Habits that were planted in their Souls, when in Infancy they were baptized and regenerated.

4. Certainly your Children when they come to age may think that they received some mighty Privilege in their Infancy, by being in the Covenant of Grace with their Parents, and so in a State safe enough; for you tell them there is no final Falling from a State of true Grace. We and you too know that, and declare that the Covenant of Grace is sure to all the true Seed or Spiritual Seed of Abraham: of which Seed you declare all your natural Off-spring as such are a part. This being so, it is evident that Ministers have no Advan-

rages ; but the contrary, in pressing the necessity of Repentance and Conversion on your Children when at age, we have the greater advantage far in preaching to our Sons and Daughters, who tell them that our Faith did not, cannot profit them, or save them, no, but that they were born in sin, and were Children of Wrath by Nature, and so remain till true actual Faith and Regeneration do pass upon them, or they do believe in Christ.

5. Besides, the Baptismal Vow you brought them under being not by God's Appointment, what Blessing can you expect from thence ? Will God own and bless a voluntary Vow, or approve of an Humane Tradition ?

6. The *Papists* (as I hinted before) may expect as well, and from as good Ground and Authority, as great advantage to press Holiness and Chastity upon those that they bring under their voluntary Vows and Covenants in their *Nunneries* and *Friaries*.

7. Besides, your Children entred not into that Baptismal-Covenant you talk of by their own consent ; they knew nothing of it, and can find no Authority from God's Word you had to bring them under it ; and therefore what power is that like to have upon their Consciences ? Had you not better bring them under a solemn Vow to become good, and to repent as soon as they come to age ; nay, bring them under an Oath, or cause them to enter into a solemn Covenant so to do, and set their Hands unto it ? But you will say, you have no Command nor Warrant from God's Word to do that ; no more, say we, have you any Command or Warrant from the Word of God to bring them under any such Baptismal Vow, to forsake Sin, the Devil, and all his Works, &c. in their Infancy.

“ Infant-Baptism is so effectual to continue the true
 “ Religion, and the Encrease of the Church of God
 “ at this time, as Circumcision formerly had been: It
 “ pleased God to continue true Religion among the Jews by
 “ bringing their Children under the Bond of the Covenant:
 “ He left them not to their own liberty, &c. and let none
 “ take upon them to be wiser than God by leaving Children
 “ at this time to follow their own Fancies, to choose their
 “ own Religion, without having God's Covenant upon them,
 “ for *Humane Nature* is as corruptible at this time as for-
 “ merly, &c.

Ans. 1. I answer; Circumcision was God's absolute and positive Command in the Jewish Church, which was national; but God hath not commanded Infants to be baptized into the Gospel-Church which is not National, but Congregational: if therefore there was the like Authority from God for the one as there was for the other, we would contend with you no longer.

2. 'Tis you that would seem wiser than God, whose Wisdom hath not led him to erect his Gospel-Church of such Materials, or of such Matter, and in such Form now, as it was his Wisdom to build the Jewish or Legal Church: Must the fleshly Seed as such be taken into the Gospel-Church by Baptism, because the Male-Infants were circumcised under the Law? Who tells you so? where is it written? Will you be wiser than God? Did not *John Baptist* say, *Think not to say within your selves we have Abraham to our Father? Now the Ax is laid to the Root of the Tree.* Now the case is altered, as if he should say; *Now we know no Man after the Flesh,* 2 Cor. 5. 17, 18.

3. Hath not God freely left us and our Children to choose to be his Servants, or to choose our Religion? Are not the Saints to be all Volunteers? Will Christ accept of *Prest-Souldiers* into his Service? Or have you any power to force, or compel your Children to be of what Perswasion in Religion you please? God, it is true, hath no more left Children now than formerly, to follow their own Fancies; no, God forbid: But he hath commanded them to *believe and be baptized*; and not to follow the Fancies of their Parents any more than to follow their own Fancies, nor Ministers who teach them contrary Doctrine to that which the Word of God doth.

4. As to the Corruption of our Nature, 'tis true that is as bad as ever; but your Sprinkling your Children in Infancy hath no Virtue or Power in it to change or purge out that Corruption; your Children receive no benefit by that you call Baptism: Say what you will, I am sure you cannot prove they receive any profit thereby.

5. I affirm God hath not commanded us to bring our Children into the Bond of the Covenant by Baptism until they believe, and you can never disprove us while you live from God's Word.

" You say, the Lord hath blessed the Baptism of Infants to
 " be a Means for the continuing of the true Religion, and of
 " the

“ the Christian Church: From the days of the Apostles even to this very day, the Lord bestoweth his particular Blessings but upon his own Ordinance; he imprinteth not the Seal of Heaven upon earthly Inventions; none can deny but that there are thousands baptized in their Infancy that feel in themselves the Virtue of their Baptism.

Answer. 1. I answer; You cannot prove that God hath any manner of ways owned or blessed Infant-Baptism: for because God hath continued a Seed to serve him in every Age since the Apostles time, will you attribute that to Infant-Baptism, which is only to be ascribed to the rich and sovereign Grace of God, and Power of his Spirit?

2. As to the true Church, for many years she was hid, and in the Wilderness she fled from the face of the *Romish Beast and cruel Dragon, Rev. 12.* I must confess Infant-Baptism hath in part been a means to keep up the name of the Christian Religion in the Church ever since the *Apostacy*; and it was contrived no doubt to make the Church great and large, *i. e.* to make *whole Families, Parishes, and Nations* the Church, this is evident; and if this be the way to continue and enlarge the Church, the Lord deliver the true Church from such a Practice and Invention of Men.

I look upon Infant-Baptism to be one of the chief Pillars of the *Romish Church*, and of all National Churches and Constitutions in the *European World*; this is that *Christendom* that is so cried up, and the way of making and continuing the pretended Christian-Name; in the Anti-Christian Church, and World, all are made Christians in their Infant-Baptism: And thus the Inhabitants of the Earth are cheated, and deluded with a Shadow and empty Name that signifies nothing; and certain I am, until *Christendom* (as it is called) is *Unchristianed* of this pretended Rite, or *Christendom*, and the Inhabitants of the Earth become new *Christianed*, there will never be a thorough Reformation: I mean until they see that Christianity, or Christian-Name, which they received by their Infant-Baptism, signifies nothing, but throw it away as an Human Innovation, and labour after true Regeneration, or a likeness to Christ, and so believe and are baptized upon the profession of their Faith, according as in the Apostolical Primitive Church: 'Tis Infant-Baptism that tends to uphold all National Churches, and deceives poor People who think they were thereby made Christians.

3. Doth it follow, because many Thousands that were baptized (as you call it) when Infants, were after they come to Age truly converted? That that blessed work of Grace upon their Hearts was by virtue of their Infant-Baptism, or from any Motive that arose from thence? Or was it not wholly done by the Power of God's Word preached to them, through the mighty Power and Operations of the Holy Ghost upon their Souls? God hath shewed his Mercy, I grant, to such Christians who were Rantized or Sprinkled, in Infancy, in a gracious manner: But this is not to be ascribed to his owning and blessing that Invention of *Pedo-Baptism*; be sure God will never own, as you well say, an Earthly Invention; and I have clearly proved that Infant-Baptism is nothing less or more than an Earthly or Human Invention, therefore God never blessed that. O how few are converted or truly regenerated that have in their Infancy been (as you say) baptized, nay of the Seed of the Faithful! What a Multitude remain ungodly, and so live and die, notwithstanding their Parents Faith, and their Reception of their Infant-Baptism! The Lord open the Eyes of you *Worthy and Noble Britains*, and send true Light among you as to this matter.

" Infant-Baptism prevents (Mr. *Owea* saith) the
 " shameful Neglect of Baptism; if Children had been
 " left unbaptized, it would be so difficult to persuade many
 " good People to receive Baptism, as at this Time 'tis
 " to persuade them to receive the Lord's Supper. The
 " Nature of Man is very unwilling to undergo narrow
 " and spiritual Obligation: We read in the History of
 " the Primitive Church that several good Men, that turned
 " from *Paganism*, delayed their Baptism until their Lat-
 " ter Days.

" *Constantine* being very Aged before he was Bapti-
 " sed, and fallen into a Disease of which he died.

" *Theodosius* was not baptized until he was fallen sick,
 " as *Socrates*, p. 5. 6. And we are not to think (say
 " you) that People would be more ready to receive
 " Baptism in these Days, than they had been in those
 " that are past,

1 *Ans.* I Answer ; it is a shameful thing indeed to see how many good People do neglect Christ's Holy Ordinance of Baptism ; and to see how difficult 'tis to persuade them, tho' they do truly believe, to be baptized, and so orderly come to the Lord's Table : But what is the reason of it ? is it not because you, and such as you, have strove to deceive them, and blind their Eyes, by telling them that Sprinkling or *Rantism*, is Baptism or Baptizing, and that they were baptized in their Infancy ? they are, alas, too ready to build their Faith herein upon their Teachers ; *The Teachers of my People (saith the Lord) cause them to err :* And (say they) such a learned Man, such a worthy Doctor and Minister is for Infant-Baptism ; Can they be mistaken ? Sure, if it were an Error, they must needs know it.

2. 'Tis not very hard to persuade our Children, when God converts them, to be baptized ; they readily submit to it ; and, until then, they have no more right to Baptism than they have to the Lord's Supper.

3. Will you to anticipate your Children, in fear they will not be baptized when they come to Age, contrary to the Word of God, baptize them when in their Infancy ? I must tell you by the same parity of Reason, since some of them you find are so hard to be persuaded to receive the Lord's Supper, you may (as the Ancient Fathers did) give them the Lord's Supper in their Infancy also ; you have as much Authority for to do the one as the other.

4. Do you not implicitly on this Occasion grant and confess, that Baptism of Right belongs to the Adult ; but that *politically* it hath been contrived to baptize Infants, for fear they should not be persuaded to be baptized when they come to Age ? And you are willing to continue the Practice, because it is in these Days by you and your Brethren rendered to be a very odious thing to be dipped or baptized when they come to Age and do believe. The Truth is, this Ordinance calls for great Abasement, and much Self-denial ; 'tis a hard thing to come under the Baptismal Covenant and Obligation, in Adult Persons, when

when we are rendered as bad as *Adulterers* and *Murderers* who baptize Men and VWomen according to Christ's Commission that are Disciples. And 'tis hard also when the baptized Person knows (he being come to Understanding) what he is bound and obliged to do by his Baptifmal Covenant, *viz.* to mortify the Remainders of Sin, and to walk in Newness of Life, *Rom* 6. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9. Therefore since you fear they will not freely and voluntarily list themselves under Christ's Banner, or become his Spiritual Souldiers when they come to Age; you will, and that unknown to them, force them into these VVars in their Infancy without Christ's Authority or their Consent, under this specious Pretence, *viz.* you fear they will not do it when they are grown up.

5. What you speak concerning those Christians, who in the Primitive Times delayed their Baptifm until the latter part of their Lives, makes directly against you; for those Christians who were converted from Paganifm to Christianity, did not only delay their Baptifm, but many Godly Christian Parents, I have shewed, in the last Chapter, did delay the baptizing of their Children until they came to Age and did believe: And the Error of that long Delay arose from that great Mistake that Baptifm washed away Sin; therefore some delayed Baptifm until such time they thought they were ready to go out of the World.

6. But what of this? Because some have erred, in staying too long before they were baptized, Will you make too great haste, and bring in little Babes to be baptized, without any Ground or Authority from the Word of God? So much shall suffice to your *Twelfth* and Last Argument.

Now, Sir, we have heard all your Proofs for the baptizing of Infants; you have, it seems, impannell'd for your *Jury*, to Sit, Hear and Determine this Grand Cause, *Just Twelve*; and if they could speak, they would (being all agreed, the Cause being also fully opened) give their Verdict on our Side, and against your Infant-Baptifm; but let them rather be so many Witnesses of your summon-
ing

ing the Statute Book, and great Charter of the Church, viz. God's Word, having been opened, and the Matter cleared. We will appeal now to our worthy Reader, particularly to the *Antient and Noble Britains*, to make Judgment for themselves: For in matters of Faith, and Things that concern our Souls, every Christian is to judg for himself.

Impartial Reader, weigh well the matter: Consider this, we must all be judged by the Word of God: If you can find you are commanded to baptize your Children by Jesus Christ in the New Testament, or can find any Precept or Precedent for it, you may do it: Or if what Mr. *Owen* hath said hath convinced you, that Baptism doth not belong to Believers, by good Authority he hath shewed from the Holy Scriptures, but that Infants are the only Subjects thereof; and that Baptism is not dipping or burying the Body in Water, but only sprinkling or pouring a few Drops of Water on the Person's Face; then continue in your former Practice till God shall open your Eyes. But if you are otherwise perswaded, that Mr. *Owen* is in an Error, then I exhort you that believe in Christ, to arise and be baptized: But lest Mr. *Owen* should say 'tis too soon for you to make Judgment yet, pray stay till we have heard his Answers to our *Objections*, and also all what he hath further to say.

C H A P. XIX.

Containing an Answer to Mr. James Owen's 16th Chapter, proving that our Objections against Infant-Baptism are very weighty, and his Answers to them very impertinent and defective.

MR. Owen begins with his Sixteenth Chapter after this manner, viz.

“ Thus have we proved by the Scripture (saith he)
“ and by several Scriptural Arguments, that the Chil-
“ dren of the Faithful ought to be baptized : if we look
“ upon this Truth in the Light of the Scriptures Above,
“ the Objections of themselves will vanish away ; yet
“ for the sake of the Weak, I shall lay down the strongest
“ of them.

I. Object. *There is neither a Command nor Example in the Scripture for the baptizing of Infants.*

To this Mr. Owen answereth, viz.

“ There is not one particular Command, *totidem verbis*,
“ naming Infant-Baptism, and that is not necessary ;
“ but there is an Universal Command to baptize all
“ Nations, of which Children are a great part.

“ If there is a Command for the baptizing of the
“ Parents, then there is a Command for the baptizing
“ of

“ of Infants ; for the Children are included in the
 “ Parents, even as Parts of them, being Partakers of
 “ the Privileges of good Parents, and of the Judgments
 “ of the wicked Parents.

1. *Ans.* I answer, Whether you have or have not proved, by the Holy Scriptures and Arguments, that Infants ought to be baptized, is now upon a fair Trial committed to the Judgment of the Impartial Reader.

2. We do not require you to bring a Command, in *totidem verbis*, or in so many Words, Let Infants be baptized : But your Inferences are not good ; for, as you have no Precept, no Command, or any Precedent to baptize them, so you can draw no fair and good Consequences for it from any Text of Scripture.

You bring the Words of the Great Commission, Matth. 28. 19, 20. *Go baptize all Nations.* Sir, Why dare you leave out part of the Words ? Is it not *Go therefore, teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c.* ? We have shewed in our Answer to you already, that the Commission requires none to be baptized but such who are first taught or made Disciples ; which Disciples St. Mark calls Believers, *He that believes and is baptized*, Mark 16. 16. They are, Reader, the Words of the same Commission, tho differently expressed by these two *Great Evangelists*, and hold forth the same thing, *viz.* That the Gospel is to be preached in all Nations, or to all the World, and that those that are disciplined by preaching, or that do believe, ought to be baptized, and none else.

3. Whereas you say that Children are a great part of the Nations, and may therefore be baptized ; this is a fallacious or deceitful Consequence : For may not I (as before) argue thus ? Unbelievers, *i. e.* *Turks, Infidels, Pagans* and their Children, are a great part of all Nations, therefore may be baptized. Sir, I appeal to your Conscience, Whether this Inference is not as good and true, from the Premises, as yours.

3. But





3. But you ask whether there is a command for the baptizing of Parents; no doubt of this, we and you agree, that there is a command to baptize Parents, that believe in Christ, and to baptize Children too that believe in Christ; ; but say you then, there is a command to baptize Infants, because they are included in the Parents, even as parts of them; now this is utterly false, and also very ridiculous, 'tis for any Man to assert it.

1. For if this was so, it follows, whatsoever God commands the Parent, he commands the Child, then when God commanded *Abraham* to offer up, or slay his Son, he commanded the Son to slay himself; it would also follow, That

2. When God commands the believing Parent to partake of the Lord's Supper, he also commands all his Children to partake of the Lord's Supper, because they are all included in their Parents.

3. If Children are thus a part of their Parents, then certainly, if the Parents go to Heaven, all their Children must go to Heaven likewise; for the whole of Believers shall be saved, and not a part of them only.

4. Also if the Children are included in their Parents, and are a part of them; why may not the Parents Baptism serve for the Child, and then it would also follow, that no Man is a compleat and perfect Man without his Children; was ever such Stuff by a Man of Parts and Learning, published to the World?

5. Sir, will your Feeding, or eating your Food, feed your Children; besure, as much as your believing and being baptized will feed the Souls of your Children.

6. Moreover, why do you say the Judgments of wicked Parents fall on their Children, did not God say that *Proverb should be used no more in Israel, but the Soul that Sins shall die*: If Children partake of the punishment of their Parents, 'tis when they are alike wicked, and walk in the same steps their ungodly Parents walked in. 'But you proceed and say, that there is no particular command for the baptizing of Women.

Answ. Male and Female are all one in Christ Jesus, and Women are called *Disciples*, and so are not Infants.

2. We have plain *presidents*, that Women were baptized, which is all one with a Command. *Acts* 8. 12. *When they believed Philip Preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized both Men and Women*; And also that *Lydia* was baptized, *Acts* 16. Do but shew us one like president where any Infant was baptized, and we will say no more.

'You say we have not a particular Command for keeping the first day of the Week as an Holy Sabbath to the Lord.

Answ. We have a command to keep the Seventh part of time, as a Sabbath to the Lord, *Exod.* 20. and plain presidents in the New Testament, That on the first day the Saints did meet to Worship God, *Acts* 20. 7. *1 Cor.* 16. 1. The first day of the Week, as the Christian Sabbath was also confirmed by the first miraculous appearance of Christ after his Ascension into Heaven, which was the day of *Pentecost*, *Acts* 2, 1, 2. give like proofs for your Infant Baptism.

'You would have us to shew what Scripture we have for re-baptizing.

Answ. I shall answer, that by and by, when I come to your next Chapter, where we have it again, we do not own it Lawful to baptize them Again, who have been once rightly baptized, but Rantism is not Baptism, nor are Infants the true Subjects of it.

'You say you have shewed already, That there are many examples in the Scripture for Infant Baptism, which are plain unto them that understand the agreement, and the consequences of Scripture.

Answ. I answer, let the Reader judge in this case, now we have examined all those Texts you draw your examples from, whether your consequences are clear and plain, or not.

'*Obj.* The Scripture calleth upon some to believe before they are baptized, *He that believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved*, *Mark* 16. 16. and according to that Rule the Apostles did not baptize any untill they believed, *Acts* 2. 38. This is the *Second Objection* Mr. Owen brings, against what he hath wrote, take his Answer. viz.

(Salth

' (Saith he) when the Scriptures saith that he that believeth and is baptized.

1. 'It mentioneth Adult Persons, *viz.* the unbelieving Gentiles unto whom Christ sent his Disciples, *Mark* 16. 15. *Mat.* 28. 19. and not the Children of the Faithful; Christ sending them into all the World to preach the Gospel into Pagan Nations, and saying, *He that believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved, Mark* 16. 15, 16. shews that neither Baptism nor Salvation belongeth unto them, until they believe in the Lord Jesus, if we were to preach unto such, we should baptize none until they would believe. But what is this to the Seed of the Faithful, of whom Christ mentioneth not.

1. *Ans.* I answer, Reader observe, that here Mr. Owen hath given away his cause for ever, for he saith Christ speaks not of the Children of the Faithful, but of the Adult: Now consider, that these two Texts which he here Quotes, *viz. Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. does contain the great and only Commission and Warranty given by the Lord Jesus, the only Law-giver about Baptizing; and if Infants are not mentioned nor intended here, there is no Warrant at all to Baptize them; for if by virtue of the great Commission, all persons must first believe before they are baptized, farewell for ever to Infant Baptism.

2. The Objection well saith, That according to this Rule or Commission, the Apostles did not baptize any until they believed which is true and he cannot refute it.

3. Consider that the Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. *Mark* 16. 15, 16. did not only authorize the Apostles to go and make Disciples among the Gentile or Pagan World, but also among the Jews, that were the Seed of Abraham, nay they were commanded first to begin (or open their Commission) to preach to them at *Jerusalem*, moreover the words of this Commission is all the Commission and Warrant, the Disciples and Ministers of the Gospel have to administer Baptism to all the Christian Nations to the end of the World. There are not two Commissions given by Christ about baptizing, one to go to the Pagan or Gentile World, and another to the believing Christian World, or to believers and

their Seed. Now there is but one Commission, and only Rule we have to baptize, therefore Mr. *Baxter* saith well, i. e. *Christ in his Commission directeth his Apostles to make Disciples, and then baptize them, promising, that he that believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved, Baxt. Confirm. p. 27.* And in another place, he saith, speaking of this only Warrant or Commission of Baptizing, *if we have it not here, where have we it.* Shall any one think Christ's Commission short and defective.

4. Mr. *Owen* saith, if we were to preach unto such that is to unbelievers or Heathens, we should baptize none until they believed. Now pray consider that this is his Commission to baptize, if he be a true Minister of Christ, let him preach to whom he will, or come where he will, he must do all things according to this Commission, as 'tis here given, neither baptize Young nor Old, neither Jew nor Gentile, Parent nor Child, until they believe, or profess their Faith in Jesus Christ; if he doth, he Violates and acts directly contrary to his only Commission, and therefore if he doth, he sins, Should any *Commissioner* of an Earthly King, act contrary to the very express words, and purport of his Commission, he certainly would be condemned, as a false and unfaithful Servant, and be turned out of his Masters Service. Mr. *Owen* saith, *That the Seed of the Faithful, Christ mentioneth not,* that is in his great Commission, *Mat. 28. 19, 20. Mark 16. 15, 16.* therefore such he must not Baptize, unless he hath from Christ received a new, or any other Commission that doth authorize him so to do.

5. And observable it is to see how Mr. *Owen* contradicts himself here, in respect of what he said before, when he mention'd the same Texts and Commission of Christ, he told us *that Children are part of the Nations* that Christ commanded to be Baptized, but now he saith, *The Seed of the Faithful, Christ mentioneth not,* and be sure now, at this turn he speaks the Truth: and if none of the Seed of the Faithful ought to be Baptized by vertue of Christs Commission, but such only of them that do believe, then no Infant; for *Teaching* is making of Disciples, so that they are to be taught so as to believe before they are to be Baptized, and that in all Nations, whether *Heathens* or *Christians*, and that also to the

the end of the World, *teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with you allways to the end of the Word.* Mat. 28. 20.

'It is certain, saith Mr. *Owen*, that this Scripture mentioneth not of Children, if it dorth they must needs be damned, for want of Faith which cannot be actually in them.

Ans. I answer, 'tis very true, that Christ in his Commission neither meaneth nor mentioneth Infants; he hath given no Commission to baptize Infants, because the words of the Commission runneth to such who are capable to be taught, to be made *Disciples* by *Teaching* and so to *Believe*, which Infants Mr. *Owen* saith, cannot actually do.

'But he adds, the Apostle saith in 2 *Thes.* 3. 10. saith he, if any would not work, neither should hee eat would not that Father be unnatural, who would take an occasion from this Scripture to starve his little Children, because they cannot work; so when Christ saith, he that believeth and is baptized; it doth not follow, that none ought to be baptized untill they believe.

Answer. 1. I answer, this seems strange, when Christ in the Affirmative declares, who he would have baptized; doth it not follow that in the Negative, none else ought to be baptized. In other cases you would not argue thus, as for Example, when God commanded *Abraham* to Circumcise his Male Infants, doth he not implicitly forbid the Circumcising of his *Female Children*, and when he commanded him to Circumcise his Male Infants on the eighth day, doth he not implicitly forbid him to circumcise them on the seventh or ninth day, and when *Paul* saith, *let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat*, doth he not forbid Infants to partake thereof, and all to come to the Lord's Supper, that do not so examine themselves, or who do not discern the Lord's Body. Moreover,

2. Are not all those Persons that a testator in his last Will and Testament leaveth out, or expresseth not, excluded from having any Legacy in the said Will; now the great Commission, Mat. 28. Mark 16. is also Christs last Will and Testament, about the right of Baptism, viz. who are right subjects, and they are expressed by their qualifications, viz. *Disciples*, or

Persons Taught, or such that believe, are not therefore all unbelievers, all *Pagans*, and ungodly persons, and ignorant Babes, that are not capable to believe, excluded from Baptism, according to *Christ last Will and Testament*; it signifies nothing to find Infants right to Circumcision under the Law, nor other the external privileges of the Seed of the Faithful then, for that was a *Legacy* given in the *Old Will and Testament*, which is abolished by *Christ*, making his New and last Will and Testament; in which the Infant Seed of Believers, are left out as touching any right they have now in Gospel times to be Members of the Gospel Church or to Baptism, &c.

3. As to that Text you mention, *2 Thess. 3. 10. If any will not work, neither let him eat.* I answer, Mr. Burkitt in that Treatise of his for Infant Baptism, which I answered, and he hath made no reply since, brings in the very same Text upon the like account; take his words, and my answer. *'Must Children be starved because they cannot work, thus (says he) Children lie under a Natural incapacity of professing actual Faith, therefore the first Text (that is Mark 16. 16.) doth not concern them any more then the latter, 2 Thess. 3. 10. now take our answer, viz.*

You have given away, say we, your Cause for ever, for if this Text, *Mark 16. 16.* does no more concern Infants then that in *2 Thess. 3. 10.* then be sure they have nothing to do with Baptism.

You and Mr. Burkitt say, that in *Mark 16. 16.* the *Adult* only, are intended, we say so too, whether then shall we go for your Infant Baptism, we can prove from many Texts, that Infants ought to Eat though they cannot Work; but how will you prove that Infants ought to be Baptized by any other Scripture, if it be not in the Commission, tho' they do not believe, or have actual Faith. Mr. Burkitt saith, Children have Mortal Bodies, therefore they must be Fed at their Parents Table, and they have Immortal Souls, and from thence he argues they ought to be Baptized, to which I answered: As Infants have mortal Bodies, and must therefore be Fed at their Parents Table, tho' they can't Work, so because they have Immortal Souls (he might as well have said) they ought to be Fed at the Lord's

Lord's Table tho' they cannot believe, nor discern the Lord's Body. The Apostle saith, *Let a Man examine himself, and so let him eat, &c.* but this say I, is spoken of the Adult; but Infants, who are capable to receive Spiritual Benefits by Christ's Death, must have the Ordinance that figureth it out, namely the Lords Supper. There is the same ground and reason therefore to conclude Infants are included, in *1 Cor. 11. 22, 23.* about receiving the Lord's Supper, as there is to conclude, that they are included, in *Matth. 21. 19. Mark 16. 15, 16.* In the Commission to Baptize, the one saith, *Let a Man examine himself,* the other saith, *He that Believeth, &c.*

' You say you have proved, That the Apostles Baptized not only the Adult, when they believed, but the Children of such also.

Ans. I have I hope to the satisfaction of all that are willing to be informed disproved what you say, and proved that the Apostles Baptized no one Infant by far better Arguments than you have brought to prove they did.

Obj. ' Infants do not understand what is done, and therefore what profiteth Baptism unto them; this Objection; Mr. Owen answereth as followeth.

This Objection, saith he, is not only against Baptism, but against Circumcision also; yet the Ordinance was profitable unto them. A little Child may receive a great gift, &c.

1. *Ans.* I answer Circumcision was God's Command, Infants had a right to it, but God has not Commanded Infants to be Baptized, God's Ordinance shall have that effect on its proper subject, which he designed by it, no doubt had it been the Will of Christ to have given Command to Baptize Infants, but it should some ways or another been profitable to them; but since he hath not Commanded it, it can no way profit them.

2. A little Child may receive a great Gift no doubt, but they must not have that given to them, that God never appointed for them. When God gave out the Commission of Circumcision, he Commanded *Abraham* as an Adult Person to be Circumcised; and also at the same time Commanded him to Circumcise his Male Children,

Children; that was by a positive Law, a gift given to all the Male Children of *Abraham*, and to all the Male Children by *Isaac* in their Generation, whether their Parents were godly or wicked; but Baptism in Christs Commission, is only given to Believers and to all that Believe, and therefore no Gift given to Infants, we must not be Wiser then God, nor add to his word.

‘ 4. *Obj.* Mr. *Owen* adds another Objection against his Doctrine, viz. *Christ was about Thirty years of Age when he was Baptized*, Luke 3. 23.

‘ 1. His answer is, though he was not Baptized until he was Thirty years of Age, yet he was Circumcised when he was eight days Old, Luke 2. 21.

‘ 2. He delayed not his Baptism, because not fit to receive it, for he was perfectly Holy from the Womb, and therefore if we are bound to imitate his example in this thing, none of those that do believe ought to be Baptized, until they be Thirty years of Age, but the Antipedobaptists walk not according to this Rule, and therefore they do think this example bindeth them not.

Answer, I answer, no doubt, if any Babe was a fit Subject of Baptism, it was the Holy Child *Jesus*, if purity and inherent Holiness, gave to the Subjects thereof the proper right, but 'tis not Holiness primarily and simply consider'd in it self, that gives any person a right to Baptism, but the meer positive Command of God, and the positive Command of God, only runs to such Persons that believe, and therefore not to Infants, tho' we grant the positive Command of Circumcision, required Male Infants to be Circumcised under the Law, which Law Christ came to fulfil, and obey in every thing, therefore Christ when an Infant was Circumcised according to the Tenor of the Law, and Order thereof; and he was Baptized also when an Adult Person, according to the Tenor and Rule of the Gospel: No doubt had it been the mind and will of God, That Infants should have been Baptized, *Jesus Christ* as an example to others would have been Baptized in his Infancy.

2. But say you, if we are to imitate our Saviour in his Baptism, we must not be baptized until we are Thirty years of age.

Answer

Answer, This is an absur'd and an idle Dream, because the Holy Ghost by mentioning the time of Christs Age when he was Baptized, and that he was about Thirty years Old, holds forth no doubt not less then this, That all persons ought to come to a *mature age*, or to ripeness of understanding, before they be Baptized, for the *Jews* looked upon that Age to be a perfect and *mature age*. The Priests did not till about that Age enter into the exercise of their Office; and therefore in opposition to what you say the *Antipædobaptists* do walk according to Christs Rule, *i.e.* the example of Christ in the point and time of Baptism, *viz.* That all persons must delay their Baptism, untill they come to such ripeness of Age, as to be grown up to *maturity* so as to understand what baptism signifies, and to be capable to believe in Jesus Christ, which some arrive unto sooner then others; for some have the understanding of Men when very Young, may be, have more wisdom at *Twelve* years of Age, then some others have at *Thirty*, but they that arrive not to understanding by the Thirtieth year of their Age, certainly never will attain to the wisdom and knowledge of Men of understanding.

2. Besides 'tis evident, that our Saviour did not enter upon his Ministry until he was baptized, to shew that no Gospel Minister should undertake to preach the Gospel, or become a pastor of a Church, that is, an unbaptized Person; and the Holy Ghost mentioning the Age of our Saviour when he was baptized, doth no doubt shew us, that the proper Subjects of Baptism, are only adult Persons, so far 'tis our rule as an Example.

' But say you, many Actions of Christ are for our instruction, which are not to be imitated, and such was his Baptism, when he was thirty Years of Age, he being willing to bear Witness to the Ministry of *John*, who began to baptize a little before, as his Example of taking the Ministry upon him, when he was thirty years of Age, and not before, bindeth not all others to follow him, so is his Example of being baptized in the same Year, no rule to all others.

Ans. I answer, though we grant that many Actions of Christ are for our instruction, which are not to

to be imitated by us, yet we say in contradiction to you, in this we are so far to imitate him, as not to admit any to Baptism; until they come to a competent degree of understanding; for had not Christ designed so far as to leave us an Example in this matter, no doubt, his Age when baptized, had not been left upon Record; nay, and had Infants been the proper subjects of Gospel Baptism, we may be sure Christ (as I said before) had been Baptized as well as he was Circumcised, when an Infant; but he being God as well as Man, foreseeing how this Ordinance in after times would be corrupted, and the proper subjects thereof changed, even from Believers, or adult Persons to Infants, thought it necessary no doubt to leave upon record the very time of his Age, when baptized, to all Generations, to put an end to this Controversie.

For this is said by the *pedobaptists*, viz. in the first age of the Church, or when baptism was first given forth Believers were Baptized, but where do you find, say they, that any Believer in all the New Testament that was baptized, did delay to Baptize his or her Child, untill they come to a ripe Age.

We answer, That we do find such an Instance in respect of our Saviours Baptism, for all must confess, that the *Blessed Virgin*, or Mother of Jesus, and *Joseph* his supposed Father, were both eminent Believers, and Baptized too, (none doubt of that) and yet they delayed or referred the Baptizing of the Holy Jesus until he became an Adult Person.

Obj. But if any should Object that John, who was the first that received a Commission to Baptize, was but a little Older then our Saviour; and therefore was not capable to Baptize Jesus Christ when he was a Babe.

I answer, tho' this be true, yet God being a free Agent, and not tyed to one Man more than to another, could not he have given Commission to any other person to have Baptized the Blessed Child Jesus, or have sent John sooner into the World; what is his pleasure to have done, he wanted not Instruments or Ministers to do; therefore it follows plainly it was not his Pleasure or Will, that Christ should be Baptized, when an Infant; to convince us that Infants are not the proper Subjects of Gospel Baptism.

4. This shews also in opposition to what Mr. Owen said before that Baptism by Gods Command, was not in the Jewish Church before *John* received Commission from Heaven to Baptize.

5. As to that you speak, of Christs not entring upon his Ministry till Thirty years of Age, that that is no example for others. I answer that he was oblig'd to fulfill both the Precepts of the Law and the Gospel; and therefore in compliance to the Law, (that the *Jews* might not Quarrel with him) he entred not on his Ministry untill that time of his Age, which the Priests and Ministers under the Law did, for he was made under the Law, and was to be subject to all the Laws and precepts thereof; and in that he is, 'tis true, no example to Gospel Ministers, but Baptism being a pure Gospel precept, in that he was by us to be Imitated so far, as we ought not to be Baptized, untill we become Adult Persons, and do believe in him, he hath left us an Example how we should follow his steps.

Mr. Owen brings in his *Fifth Objection* against his Doctrine and practice of Infant Baptism, viz. *If Infant Baptism belongs to Infants, why do not you give them the Lords Supper.*

Take his answer, 'Because, saith he, the Apostle Commands those that receive the Lords Supper to examine themselves, and to discern the Body of the Lord, which little Children cannot do.

Ans. I answer: And as the Apostle Commands all that receive the Lords Supper to examine themselves, and to discern the Lords Body, so likewise *John Baptist*, the Lord Jesus and his Apostles too, Commanded all that received baptism to believe and repent, and to bring forth Fruits meet for Repentance, which little Babes cannot do. Repent and be Baptized every one of you, Acts 2. 37. If thou believest with all thy Heart thou mayest, Acts 8. 37. that is, be baptized.

2. You say, Baptism is the Sacrament of our Regeneration, and of our Admission into the Church of God; the Lords Supper is a Sacrament of our Growth and Spiritual Food.

1. I answer, this quite overthrows your Infant Baptism, unless you *Presbyterians* do believe as the Church of England doth, or at leastwise, what they affirm, viz. that

that Baptism doth regenerate the Child, is Baptism an Ordinance or Sacrament of Regeneration, *i. e.* to regenerate Persons, or to hold forth that regeneration, or the New Birth is wrought in such that are baptized, why then do you baptize Infants, who are not the Subjects of Regeneration? Can they die to Sin, and are they raised up out of the Water new Born Creatures, to walk in newness of Life.

2. If your Infants are new born, or born again by Baptism, no doubt the Food of the new Creature, *viz.* the Lord's Supper ought to be given to them. The first Sacrament holds forth, 'tis clear, a Person born again, or a Babe of Grace; the other is Food, fit and proper for that New born or Regenerated Person, that he may grow thereby, therefore they belong both to one and the same Subjects, and neither of them it appears from hence do belong to Infants, but

3. Are all the Infants that you baptize, let in as Members of your Church, are they absolutely Members of your Congregations, as having the Ordinance of Admission, is the Door of God's House opened to them? How can you then (say I) deny them the privilege of true and lawful Members, shall your little Members, your Lambs in Christ's Fold being New Born be starved, what shall the regenerated Babe not be fed with the Food of their Fathers House?

4. But if thus, what number of Members have you in your Churches, that have not their Names in your *Church-book*, nor perhaps, never looked after when grown up, nor cast out, though prophane and Wicked? for do you cast out or exclude all such Children you baptized, when grown up, if not, what polluted Churches are yours. Infant Baptism was doubtless contrived to encrease National Churches, or to make national Churches, and it doth tend indeed, to increase and continue that Christian Religion that is in Name only, and not in Power; you have, its true in *England*, by meer necessity lost your National Constitution, and are become Congregational, whether you will or no, but Infant Baptism will not accord with a congregation Constitution, nor do such Churches

ches so constituted that are for Infant Baptism, own their Babes to be proper and true Members of their Churches so far as I can learn, what then signifies your Sacrament of Admission, if they are not in truth admitted and owned as Members, and allowed the Food and Priviledges of such.

3. ' You say it was formerly, though Circumcision ' belonged to Infants, yet the Paschal Lamb belonged ' not but to the Adult.

Ans. I answer, this is denyed, prove if you can, that the little Children in the Jewish Church were not admitted to eat of the Passover, it is positively said, *Exod. 12. 34. That the whole House were to eat thereof, even a Lamb for an House*, and I find a great Writer asserting the same thing, that little Children did eat thereof, they were to bring their Children once or twice a Year before the Lord; and I see no ground you have to say that none but Adult Persons did eat thereof.

2. But let that be as it will, that which was or might be the right of *Jewish Church-Members* or not their right, is no rule for us in the Gospel Church, as I have sufficiently prov'd; and before all baptized Persons who are regular Members of a Gospel Church, cannot be denyed the Lord's Supper without Sin. So much to your Answers to our Objections, you might might have brought twice as many more.

C H A P. XX.

In Answer to Mr. James Owen's 17 Chapter, wherein the Antipedo Baptists are cleared of those foul Charges he hath cast upon them; and 'tis proved, that to deny Infant Baptism is no Sin, nor are those guilty of Murther nor Adultery that baptize or dip Men and Women in Water, in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; (as Mr. Owen charges them) but contrariwise it is proved, that to Baptize or Rantize Infants, is an unlawful Practise and very Sinful.

YOU say, you shall demonstrate in this Chapter, how great the Sin is of those that are tempted to deny the Baptism which they receive in their Infancy, and that suffer themselves to be baptized again; there are many People that know not the nature of their first Baptism, and are perverted to renounce it, thinking that they do please God in so doing, but they fall into Temptation and the Snares of the Devil, who is the Author of Errors and Father of falshood.

Ans. I hope by this time, the Reader may discern how great an error 'tis to call Rantism or Sprinkling Baptizing, and that Infant Baptism is also an error, being a meer human innovation, this I have prov'd, and therefore 'tis so far from being a Sin to disown it and cast it away, that it is every good Christians Duty so to do, that would in all things walk by the rule of God's Word. And for Mr. Owen to charge our People after this manner, as if we were perverted and insnared by the Devil, in denying our Infants Baptism, is just as the Papists used to charge the Protestants that disowned the human Traditions, and the vain

Foppe.

Fopperies of their rotten Church, and thunder'd out their Bulls against them.

1 'You say they are guilty of great Sin, insomuch ' that they neglect to make a right use of their first ' Baptism, Infant Baptism putteth them under continu- ' al Vow to the Lord, and they are bound to renew ' their Vows, to take the Lord to be a God unto them, ' as soon as they come to age.

Ans. 'Tis true, you brought them under an Obligation or a Vow, to take the Lord to be their God in their Infancy, but why did you do it, unless you had any Warrant or Authority from God; for to do such a thing in his Name without his Authority, is Sinful.

2. You might better have stayed till they came to Age of understanding, and if you would bring them under a Vow, have caused them then to have entered into a Covenant to take the Lord to be their God, and no doubt your Children might more dread to break such a Vow they consented to and freely made, then a Covenant or Vow you caused them to enter into in their Infancy, to which they never consented; but perhaps you will say, you have no Ground nor Authority from Gods word to do that, as much every way as you have in Infancy to baptize them, which we say is no Baptism at all, much less Christ's true Baptism, therefore God thereby obliged them not to do what you speak, but it is their Duty when grown up, if God gives them Faith to cast it away as an humane Tradition, and to enter into God's Holy Baptismal Covenant as Believers, according to Christ's great Commission.

3. Christ's Baptism, or the Baptism of Believers was not ordained to oblige Persons who are in their natural State (whether young or old) to be come the Lord, or to be regenerated, or to die to Sin, &c. but as being his, or regenerated before baptized, their baptismal Covenant obligeth them to walk as the Lord's People in newness of Life; so that it appears, that Infants baptismal Covenant, is directly repugnant in the end and design of Christ's true Baptismal Covenant, (as I have more fully evenc'd in the Epistle to this Book,

Book, Dedicated to all Godly Pedo-Baptists) to which I refer the Reader.

‘ You say you see the greatest part of Children when they come to Age, be either ignorant, or inconsiderate of their Baptismal Vows, &c. for which you blame Ministers and Householders in not Catechising and Teaching them, and thus say you, Satan tempts them to cast the Blame upon their Baptism, &c.

Ans. You may see what a vain thing an human invention is, what impression can that make on the Conscience of Persons when Grown up, that God never Commanded nor promised to bless.

2. But take heed you do not father that upon the Devil which is done by *Jesus Christ*, ’tis not Satan that tempts us to cast a slight on Infant Baptism, or makes us look upon it as an insignificant thing, but ’tis through Christ’s gracious influences, by opening our Eyes to see ’tis a meer humane rite, and invention of Man’s own Brain, therefore we threw it away, and entered into a new and true Baptismal Covenant, and many others also do day by day.

‘ You (say you) appeal to the Consciences of those that are rebaptized, is not the thing thus? Let their Consciences dictate and reprove them, say you, of this sinful Carelessness, that they never made a right use of their first Baptism, if they had received profit from the first, they would not have at all renounced it.

Ans. 1. I will take this appeal to be made to me, though never re-baptized, even to my Conscience; and I do solemnly declare, I doubt not but all my Brethren can speak the same thing, that the reason why we cast off our Infant Baptism or rather *Rantism*, was because we were fully convinced it was no Ordinance of Christ, and therefore knew it could be of no profit to us.

2. You mistake it seems, as if you dreamed, that the most of those that cast off Infant Baptism were People of *Ill-lives*, and also seem to intimate, as if such of your People when grown up that are pious, who do choose the Lord to be their God, do it by virtue of their Baptismal Vow; no no, that had no such effect upon them, ’tis only the Grace of God in them, ’tis by virtue of his Spirit, and evident ’tis, that the persons

t
n
a
l
n
t
v
y
a
o
o
P
f
B
P
th
n
o
.
.
.
.

sons generally that first doubt about the truth of Infant Baptism, are persons of Religion and Piety; therefore 'tis not for want of Religion or Zeal for God, they throw away Infant Baptism, but it is from their Religion and Love to God, and Zeal to his Name, that so they may not be guilty of adding to his Word, or taking that for Christ's true Baptism, which is none of it. Is it a Sin to cast off Mens inventions?

2. 'They are guilty; you say, of great Sin, by 'prophaning the Ordinance of Christ; is it a 'small thing to prophane Sacred Things, although 'some do so through ignorance, Baptism is a sacred thing 'which ought to be received but once, *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*, Eph. 4. 4. therefore those that re- 'new their Baptism, take, the name of God in 'Vain, &c.

Ans. I answer, is it not a great Sin to change the Holy Ordinance of Christ from Baptism to *Rebaptism*; or in English, from dipping the whole Body in Water, to the sprinkling a little Water on the Face, and to change the true Subject from a Believer to an Infant; is not this to prophane a most holy Ordinance and a sacred Thing? and 'tis no doubt a great Evil, though done ignorantly, because you sprinkle them *into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy-Ghost*, without his Authority, God never commanded it at your Hands; is not this to prophane his most Holy and Sacred Name, and since it appears there is but one Baptism in Water; and you cannot deny, but do own Believers Baptism was at first instituted and appointed of Christ; it plainly then follows, that Infant Baptism is none of Christs Institution, 'tis no Baptism of Christ, 'tis not that one Baptism he appointed and ordained, we own but one Baptism, and that is the Baptism of Believers; if you have got another, look you to that, for there is but *one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism*, Eph. 4. 4.

3. 'They are (you say) guilty of unbelief, unless 'God telleth them in *totidem verbis*, baptize your Children, they will believe not, Faith looketh upon every 'beck of the Lord, the least appearance of his Will, 'the Woman which had the bloody Issue believed. if

‘ she could but touch the Garment of the Lord Jesus,
 ‘ she should be whole, though she had neither a Pro-
 ‘ mise, nor Command, nor a particular Example pro-
 ‘ voking her in so doing, &c.

Ans. I answer, will you charge us with unbelief, be-
 cause we cannot believe that to be a Truth, for which
 we have neither Command nor Example, nor for
 which there can be no good Consequence nor Inference
 drawn from any Text of Scripture, nor in doing of
 which we have no promise, nor are they which do it
 under any threatening in all the book of God? this
 seems very strange, must we believe Infant Baptism,
 because you and others say it is a Truth, by the same
 argument we must or may believe all *Papish Rites*, di-
 vided Fables and Ceremonies, what innovations may
 not your Faith take hold of according to what you
 speak here, is there no difference in believing in Christ
 in things respecting matters of Faith, which directly
 lie under his Promise, and believing things which are
 matter of Practice, which depends wholly upon Christ’s
 mere positive Command? we must have some Ground
 or Foundation from God’s Word to believe ’tis a
 Truth, which you blame us for not believing; and
 we declare that we see we have no Ground, no Founda-
 tion to build our Faith nor Practice upon, in the case
 of Infant Baptism, and are we guilty of unbelief from
 hence, what Divinity is this you preach and publish
 to the World, you would have us act upon an impli-
 cite Faith, or believe as the Church believes, do
 you not talk like a Son of the Church of *Rome*?

2. Had the Woman that had the *Issue of Blood* no
 Command, no Example, nor no Promise to believe
 Christ would heal her? Do you believe what you seem
 to affirm, did she never see nor hear of any Person that
 Christ had cured, sure you cannot imagine any such
 thing; she could not have believed unless she had
 some good Ground, did she not know the power of
 Christ was great, if we had but heard of one Infant
 baptized by Christ or his Apostles upon the Faith of
 their Parents, as we find some Children were healed
 by the Faith of their Parents, we should not be such
 unbelievers as we now are about Infant Baptism.

' You say the *Woman of Canaan* comes boldly with
 ' her Child unto Christ for to receive benefit, though
 ' she was not invisible Covenant with God, and Christ
 ' commended her Faith, and received her Daughter,
 ' her Faith breaks through all impediments, *Mat. 15.*
 ' 22. 28. Her Faith was great, who against Hope
 ' believed in Hope; is not thy unbelief great, who
 ' destroyest the foundation of Hope touching thy
 ' Children. O question not the promise of God
 ' through unbelief, but be strong in Faith giving Glory
 ' to God.

1. *Ans.* Must we boldly bring our Children to
 Baptism without any authority from Christ, because
 the *Woman of Canaan* come boldly to him, to have
 her Daughter healed of her Boldly Disease, she had
 ground for her Faith, but we have none for such a
 Practice.

2. Do we destroy the foundation of our Hope, about
 the State of our Infants, because we dare not baptize
 them without a word from Christ, or without Authority
 from him? No Sir, we have ground to hope our
 Children that Die are as happy as yours, tho' never
 Baptised; and that from Gods word. Hath not Christ
 said, *Of such are the Kingdom of Heaven*, no doubt God
 hath comprehended Infants in his eternal electing Love
 that Die, for whom he also gave his Son, and in some
 secret way doth Sanctifie them, or makes them meet
 for glory above; and we have as much ground to hope,
 that God will give Grace to those Children of ours
 that live, as you have to hope he will give Grace to
 yours. Doth your Baptism save your Infants? Will
 you say with the *Old Erroneous Fathers*, and *Blind Pa-*
pists, that Baptism washes away Original Sin? Your
 expressions look that way, I am afraid of you.

' Ought we not to believe (say you) for our Chil-
 ' dren, that Christ will receive them? Is he more un-
 ' ready to administer Spiritual Blessings, than he was
 ' in administering Temporal Blessings to the Children
 ' of the Faithful?

Ans. Let Christ receive whom he pleases, *He will*
have mercy upon whom he will have mercy, And receive
 and Bless, whom he will receive and Bless; no doubt
 his Sovereign Grace is extended to many of the Chil-

dren of the Faithful now as formerly, but what of this, because he healed some little Children in the days of his Flesh, of their Bodily Distempers. Will you therefore baptize them without any Authority received from him, you may if you please as well argue thus, *viz.* Jesus Christ Fed many little Children with Temporal Food, when he Fed the multitude, therefore they must come to the Lords Table, and be fed with Spiritual Food : Is this to argue like a Man of Wisdom and Learning.

3. ' They are guilty (you say) of Pride, thus you ' charge those that deny Infant Baptism. The humble ' submitteth to every Revelation of the Will of God; ' (say you) God hath left divers things obscure in the ' Scripture, that we might search them, and judge ' humbly of our Selves, who know things only in ' part, seeing through a Glass, in a parable; Is it not ' great pride, that a simple Man should take upon him ' to teach God, how to speak in his Word, let the ' Lord speak his Mind clearer about Childrens Baptism, or else we will not believe him, say some, is ' not this a proud reasoning of the Heart of Man? ' The humble Heart searcheth the Scriptures, and ' considereth the agreement of one Scripture with another, believing the consistency of the Old Testament with the new, and fearing every untrodden ' Path, there be great Truths as secret Treasure in ' the field of the Scripture, which the Humble searcheth and findeth, but the Proud despiseth and comes ' short thereof.

Ans. I answer, Is it Pride in us not to believe that to be a truth, that is no where revealed in Scripture, or is it not folly in you to believe such a thing to be of God's appointment; and yet upon the most diligent Search that can be made into God's Word, nothing can be found therein to prove it so to be.

2. Because some things that are matter of Faith (I say again) or some Truths of the Gospel do lie obscure, and in dark parables in the sacred Scripture, doth it follow that one of Christs great Gospel Institutions, nay one of the great Sacraments (as they are called) doth lie so dark and obscure therein also? this is strange, *Moses* who gave out the Laws of the Old Testa-

Testament from God as a Servant, made every thing plain, that is, he shewed them plainly what the command and precept was, *so that he that run might read it*, and will any Man think that our Lord Jesus who *was as faithful as a Son over his whole House*, would be less faithful, and leave an Ordinance so dark and obscure, that there is not any Precept nor Example in all the New Testament for any such thing, did Christ ever give forth Gospel Precepts in dark Parables, *Wonder O Heavens.*

8. We say Infant Baptism is not layd down in the Scripture obscurely or darkly, but do affirm in the holy fear of God, that it is not at all to be found therein; and it may appear to all that you cannot prove that it is, if God never so darkly had declared it, we would receive it, but because he hath neither plainly nor obscurely revealed, That 'tis his Institution, we do reject it, and we shall not be charged with Pride in so doing; 'tis I fear too evident that you are left in this Case by the Lord to believe a lie, and may be because you will not believe nor receive the plain Revelation of the baptism of Believers, tho' no one Truth lies more clear and plain in God's Sacred Word.

4. Is it pride in you, because you will not own the *Common-Prayer*, and the Rite of *crossing in Baptism*, and *God-fathers* and *God-mothers*, these things (you may be) believe not, but not because they are left darkly in the Scripture, but because they are merely human inventions, or not at all to be found in the Scripture.

'You say we will not believe, unless you shew us some Command or some clear example for Infant Baptism, that it is of God, but if there had not been any Command or Example (although both be for Infant Baptism) if there be Scripture Consequences, shewing they ought to be baptized, That is sufficient to satisfy the humble searcher, did not Christ shut the Mouths of the *Sadducees* about the Resurrection by Scriptural Consequence? *Mat, 22. 32.*

1. *Ans.* I answer, are we not to be commended for not believing that to be a Truth, for which there is neither Command nor example? Why do you not use Crossing in Baptism, nor Oyl nor Honey as the Papists do? Is

it not because you find no Command nor Example for any such things.

2. It seems strange you have both Command and example for Infant Baptism in the Holy Scripture; and yet cannot find either, or else none can find them, but your selves.

3. But could you produce as fair Consequences from any Text for it, as our Saviour did to prove the Resurrection, we would receive it readily: But I have shewed all your Consequences are nothing to the purpose, but if you know Truth, you need not fly to far-fetch'd Consequences.

4. These *Antipeleobaptists*, say you, which receive 'rebaptization, are guilty of great uncharity: *Charity* 'is the fulfilling of the Law, 1 Tim. 1. 5. and love also 'is the fulfilling of the Gospel; and therefore we ought 'to be jealous of every Opinion that destroys Charity; 'God is Love, and those Truths that are of God, 'are agreeable to Charity, but this Opinion which denyeth Infant Baptism, is a very uncharitable Opinion 'which casteth out Children from the Household of God, 'of which they were Members for some Thousand of 'Years, is it not an uncharitable opinion which excommunicates them out of the Church of God.

1. *Ans.* I answer could you prove Infant Baptism to be a Truth of God, you had cause to charge us, but that the Reader may see, you cannot do.

2. Nor can you prove Infants were ever received as Members of the Gospel Church, therefore it is a false Charge to say our Opinion casteth them out or Excommunicates them out of that.

3. Take heed least it be found one day that you are a Man that wants Charity towards Christ himself, who is the only builder of his Gospel Temple, and who did not in his Wisdom think good to take in the fleshly Seed into the Gospel Church as they were received into the *Typical and legal Church of the Jews*.

'You intimate that we have Excommunicated them, 'and that without a Cause, before they had done any 'thing for to merit this hard Judgment, is not this (say 'you) an uncharitable Opinion which denyeth them the 'same place in the Covenant of Grace under the Gospel, 'as they had under the Law, is not that an uncharita-
ble

ble Opinion which maketh their condition worser, 'since the coming of Christ then it was before? in short, 'is it not (say you) an uncharitable Judgment, which 'denie s them a share in the promise, *Acts* 2. 39. 'is not God a God unto the Seed of the Faithful, what, 'hope then can we have of their Salvation.

1. *Ans.* It was not for the sin or demerits of Infants that God hath not received them as Members of the Gospel Church, only it was his own Sovereign Will and Pleasure not so to do, nor can you prove that this is any spiritual loss unto our Infants.

2. God hath as much cast out the Sons of his Gospel Ministers (as such) from having any part in the Ministry, which you know they had under the Law: For every Son of a Priest, when grown up, was of the Priesthood, and this is denied to our Sons as such. Another may say, what Sin have our Sons committed, that this great priviledge is denied them, since Christ came? Also, why should not our Children have the promise of an *External Canaan*, as the *Jewish Children* had under the Law, what have they done to procure this loss.

3. We do not deny Infants the same priviledges and place in the Covenant of Grace, which they ever had, no God forbid; our Children have every way (no doubt) like place in that Covenant which the Children of the faithful had under the Law, even them and all them of our Children, that have the saving blessings of Christ Merits, and of the said unchangeable and eternal Covenant, but we say they are not in the Covenant of *peculiarity* God made with *Abrahams* Natural Seed as such; and so partake not of the external Rites and Priviledges of the Gospel Church, or New Creation, until they do believe or are called by the Lord according to that promise you cite, *Acts* 2. 39.

4. What a noise do you make about your Infants great loss by our Opinion; alas you cannot prove or make it appear they have any real Spiritual loss, hereby, our Children have the same spiritual blessings now as ever, and God is as much the God of our Seed in a spiritual sense, as ever he was to the Seed of the Faithful; all that we say is this, that our Infants have no

right to the external Ordinance of Baptism nor any but believers only ; and pray what wrong is this to them ? Is there no hope therefore left us of the Salvation of our dying Infants ? what is it to give our Infants as such, the sign, who have not the thing signified thereby, you would have them have the *Shell* that have not the *Kernel*, and because we will not give them the one, till God gives them the other, we are censured as uncharitable, What good did *Simon magus* his Baptism do him ? Will Baptism save your Infants ? and if all the Seed of the Faithful are (as you say) in the Covenant of Grace, they are safe enough whether they are baptized or not, we cannot bring them into that Covenant, nor cast them out of it.

5. And now Sir, pray do you attempt for once to do more then all your brethren have done Before you, *viz.* prove what Spiritual or Temporal benefits your Children do receive by their pretended Baptism, Mr. *Burkitt* made assay to do this, but he is answered, and says no more, and I purpose for the sake of the *Ancient Britains*, for whom I have always had great love, and an honourable esteem of, to take a little pains to transcribe Mr. *Burkitts* arguments in this respect, and my answers by and by.

6. 'Tis evident that baptism doth not infuse Grace into them, nor the habits thereof, it does not change their Hearts; it doth not take away Original Sin. God can do it, 'tis true, nay, and God doth no doubt, change the Hearts of such dying Infants that are saved ; but prove if you can, their baptism doth this, and then.
2. what external priviledges of the Church do your Infants (as such) receive, that are as, you say, baptized, you will not own them for *Brethren* and *Sisters*, until they are Converted, you will not give them the Lords Supper until they are converted, they are not by the Lord's appointment brought under any Obligation by being baptized; and then as few of your Children, 'tis plain, become godly as of ours, pray shew us when you write again, what blessings or priviledges your Infants do receive by their *Baptism*, or *Baptism* as you call it ? What uncharitableness is it then in us to deny our Infants that thing, which you cannot prove if they had it, would do them any manner of good.

Nay

Nay Sir, I shall prove before I have done with you that it may do them much hurt:

5. ' Those that are against Infant Baptism; and for renewing of it (you say) are guilty of a great ingratitude towards God, we know that ingratitude is a great Sin against the Lord : Unthankfulness for Temporal blessings provokes him to Anger, *Rom. 1. 21.* *Luke 17. 17, 18.* how much more for Spiritual blessings and priviledges. — Is it not great ingratitude in us to despise our birth-right ? The Scripture puts a reproachful Character upon *Esau, &c.*

Ans. All this is to no purpose, 'tis but begging the Question, *viz.* That Infant Baptism is God's Ordinance, and a birthright priviledge which we utterly deny, for tho' Baptism be a priviledge by Christs positive Command, it only belonging to the *Second Birth*, not to the *First*.

' Thou art guilty of a great Sin (say you) by making a division in the Body of Jesus Christ, there is one Body and one Baptism, *Eph. 4. 4.* And they cannot be divided, whereas by denying of the first Baptism thou breakest the Unity of that Body, to the which Christ is Head, thou breakest thy self off from the Vine, and witherest as an unfruitful Branch, which will not be better although it be Watered again; thou breakest thy self off not from this Congregation or another only; but from the Universal Catholick Church in every Age and Countrey upon the Face of the Earth, which is cleansed with the washing of Water through the Word, *Eph. 5. 26.* and continuing in the Union of Baptism. Canst thou think this to be a small sin for thee to rent thy self from the Body of Christ, though *stolen Water be sweet at this time, and Bread eaten in secret be pleasant.* Know and see that it will be evil and bitter in the end, for thee to cast thy self out of the Church of the Living God, the Pillar and ground of Truth.

1. *Ans.* I answer untill I came hither in your Book, I did not fully perceive your bitter Spirit. O that God would appear and give you a better temper of Heart : Who is uncharitable now, if Charity be the Bond of perfectness ? How imperfect is my Brother Owen ? Must we all who deny Infant Baptism, be Condemned as utter

ter cast away, and not be lookt upon so much as Members of the Universal Church? 'Tis well, it is not in your power to reprobate us and our Children.

2. But stay a little, are all that own Infant Baptism, or have been baptized in every Age and Nation of the Earth, the Body of Christ, and Church of the living God? Do you indeed own the Popish Church, or is not the Church of *Rome* in your Judgment, however part of the Body of Christ? And are not you in Union with that Church, and all Churches that own Infant Baptism in the World? it followeth it must be so. I think 'tis time for you, most *Worthy Britains*, to have a Jealous Eye towards this Man, for if he be not in actual Communion with the *Church of Rome*, yet his principles lead him out so to be; for he seems to own all the Churches to be the Body of Christ, who were and are baptized in Infancy, nay, and that those Churches, and none but them to make up the whole Mystical Universal Church of God. He seems to reprobate all those Christians that deny Infant Baptism, or are disjoyned from his Universal Catholick Church of baptized Infants. I know his *Reverend Brethren* in *London*, are Men of more Charity, and abhor such positions as he now lays down. I cannot think that his principles allow Salvation to any that are not in Union with the visible Universal Church that own Infant baptism, 'tis time to throw this Idol away.

3. Is it a sin to divide from the Church of *Rome*, or from the Church of *England*, or not to continue of their Communion? Are not you one that have separated your self from both, and more immediately from the last: But I suppose you own them both to be true Churches, tho' you have separated your self, but if so, how can you clear your self of abominable *Schism*, for you have made a division in that Body, which you declare is the Body of Christ, and Church of the living God? Can those things for which you have made this division, justify your *Schism*? Sir, tho' we believe there are many Holy and Gracious Christians of the Communion of the Church of *England*, and that they are Members of the Invisible Universal Church, yet we do not believe the Church of *England*, nor any National Church, is an orderly true Constituted Visible Church of Jesus Christ

Christ and therefore we separated from them, but this it appears is not your belief.

4. Your Judgment is, it appears, that no Person can be a Member of the Universal Catholick Church, that was not baptized, and so United to her in Infancy, or Sprinkled when an Adult Person, *i. e.* he must own Infant Baptism. Sir I never met with a Man like your self, as I can remember of less Charity; and yet you cry out against us for want of Charity.

5. I do affirm that, that one Baptism that Unites to the Visible Church (not to the Universal Church) is the Baptism of Believers, and not that of Infants; And to prove it, take this argument. *If that Baptism the Apostles administred, and on which they received all Persons into the Visible Church, was the Baptism of the Adult, or that of Believers only; then the baptism of the Adult, or that of Believers only, is that one and first Baptism; but the baptism which the Apostles administred, and on which they received all Persons into the Visible Church, was the baptism of the Adult, or that of Believers only.* Ergo, The Baptism of the Adult, or that of Believers, is that one or only Baptism of Christs Visible Church; for those Members of the visible Church in the Primitive times, that were washed in Baptismal Water, professed themselves washed also in Christs Blood, and they that were sincere had the thing signified, as well as the Sign when they were baptized, but Infants never made any such profession, therefore Infant Baptism was not the first and one Baptism that Christ left in his Church.

6. It is true that those that deny Infant baptism, deny the Communion of the National Church, of which perhaps they were once Members, but this is not to make a division in the Mystical Body of Christ; nor in a true Constituted Gospel Church. 'Tis a duty to come out from every false Church, *Come out of her, my People,* Rev. 18. 4.

7. If baptism be that Ordinance that Unites us into the true Visible Church, and Christs baptism be that of Believers, then Mr. Owen in denying of believers baptism, (which I have proved is that one baptism) is as much guilty of Sin in hindring that Union (by obstructing as much as in him lieth, Believers to be baptized, and so Unite them to the said true Visible Church of Christ,

Christ as those that divide from it; and is this a small sin, but Believers baptism is that Uniting Ordinance, without baptism upon profession of Faith, no Person according to the rule of the Gospel can be United to a true Visible Church of Christ, It is a dangerous thing to hinder persons from Joyning with a true Church, as renting from it, but so it is not for leaving of a false Church.

8. From hence also it appears that our separation from those Churches that are Constituted upon Infant Baptism, do but divide from such Churches that are not orderly gathered or Constituted according to the rule of the Gospel and Institution of Jesus Christ, and therefore no sin so to do.

9. Nay, and evident it is that the greatest Body of Mr. Owens *Universal Catholick Church*, is *Antichristian*: For I think none question but the *Popish Church*, which is founded on Infant baptism, is for Number more then the *Protestant Churches*; however the *Roman Church* must be by what he intimates one great part of the Catholick Church, or *Church of the living God*.

10. And lastly, Mr. Owen mistakes, the Waters we drink of, who maintain *Believers Baptism*, are not *Stolen Waters*, but Waters lawfully come at, being taken out of the Fountain of Gods Word, and are part of the *Waters of God's Sanctuary*; and therefore they are sweet to our Souls, and our Bread is from our Fathers Table, being no other than what all the Children of God did feed upon in the *Apostolical Primitive times*: and his *Stolen Water of Infant Baptism* may prove bitter at the end, notwithstanding his vain boasts, but let him see to that, may be God may open his Eyes, and cause him to Vomit it up by Repentance, which I shall rejoyce to hear.

'you say, this division is very much alike unto that of the Antient *Donatists*, who were for rebaptizing because they accounted them sinners that first baptized them, &c.

Ans. We are, I tell you again, as much against rebaptizing as you can be, but you want the essentials of Baptism, both in respect to the form of baptism, and the subjects thereof. Sprinkling is not baptizing, and Infants are not the true Subjects of Christ's baptism, but Believers only.

You

You proceed to give out of History the opinion of the *Ancient Fathers* about rebaptizing. ' Thus saith (say you) *Optatus. Et quid vobis visum est non post nos sed post trinitatem baptismum geminare?* Why do you rebaptize not only after us, but after the Trinity. *Opt. Lib. 5. p. 51. Opt. Lib. 5. page 61. Quicumque a vobis se rebaptizari, &c.* Whoever consenteth to be rebaptized by you, he riseth up certainly but naked, because he hath permitted you to deprive him of his Wedding Garment.

' *Austin* saith, *Revera enim fieri potest ut sceleratior sit Rebaptizator totius hominis quam solius corporis interemptor Aug. ad Eleusum Ep. 163.* It being possible for him who baptizeth the whole Man to be worser then him, who killeth the Body only. Again, *Rebaptizare haereticum hominem omnino peccatum est immanissimum.* It is a sin to rebaptize an Heretick, but to rebaptize a Catholick, or one in Unity with the Universal Church, is a dreadful Sin. *Aug. de unico Bapt. cap. 13.* If any (say you) judge these are words too harsh, let them consider that they are *Austin's* words and not mine, I set them down for to shew the Judgment of the Old Primitive Church about rebaptization.

Ans. w. I answer, these Instances hurt not us, for it appears in both these Quotations, that the Persons rebaptized were Dipped first when baptized, and might be Believers also, for in the first, that word implyeth no less, *viz. riseth up*, denoting he was buried in the Water. Your Infants when baptized (as you call it) cannot be said to rise up; and *Austin's* words imply plainly the baptizing the whole Body, *who baptizeth*, saith he, *the whole Man*, but you only Sprinkle, and not the whole Body, but the Face only. These Instances make against your *Rantism* or Sprinkling, but since you make such a stir in charging us with *rebaptization*, and fain would have us be what we are branded with, *viz. Anabaptists*. I shall now shew you the opinion also of some of the *Ancient Fathers* and *Modern Divines*, about reiterating of baptism.

Gregory saith *l. 1. Ep. 7. That that is not said to be reiterated, which is not certainly demonstrated to have been rightly and duly done*, and in another place saith, *if there be an offence taken at the Truth, it is much better that offence be taken*

taken than that the Truth should be deserted, the Custom of the Churches ought to submit to the words of Christ, not the words of Christ to be wrested to the Custom of the Church, in regard the words of Christ, are the foundation upon which all Customs are to be build. hom. 7. in Ezechiel.

Cyprian saith, It being more proper for the wise, and and those that fear God to obey the manifest and open Truth, freely, and without delay, then obstinately and pertinaciously to resist it. Cyprian Epist ad Iubian. See Dr. du Veil on Act. cap. 2.

Scorus saith (Dr. du Veil) having alledg'd the Judgment of Alexander the Third, touching the baptizing of those of whom it was doubted whether they were baptized or no, takes an occasion to recommend three Maxims, the

First, is where there is a possibility, the safest way is to be chosen,

Secondly, Where there is no possibility, the next, to the safest way is to be made use of.

Thirdly, When Impossibility ceases, every thing is to be supplied, which Impossibility would not admit.

These Maxims are so agreeable to reason, (saith the Learned Dr. Du Veil) whoever intends to follow, will never question, but that they ought to be baptized, if they have not received that baptism Ordained by Christ, but only Rharism. that is, the Sprinkling substituted (saith he) in its room by a vulgar use, or rather abuse, as Luther calls it. thus Dr. Duveil in Historical expost, of Acts. cap. 2. page 86.

That famous Divine John Forbes saith, Nor is it to be doubted but that they again ought to be baptized, who before have only received a Vain Washing, and not the true Sacrament of Baptism: And though it be not so great as the Papists imagine, yet the necessity of this Sacrament is very great, and the profit and advantage very considerable. See Dr. du Veil Act. 2. page 87.

Tertullian saith, Whatsoever savours contrary to Truth is heresy though it be an Ancient Custom.

Thus you see the Learned, though they own not rebaptization, where baptism at first was duly administered, yet such who at first received only a pretended baptism, ought to be truly baptized; to baptize a Believer again, is sinful and very unlawful thing, but since yours is no Baptism but only Rharism, our practice is no rebap-

rebaptization, for as you do not the Act, so 'tis not done on the proper subject.

7. 'They are guilty, say you, (that is; such as deny 'Infant Baptism) of a great sin, by giving offence to 'many that were baptized in their Infancy, tempting 'them to think that they are not under any vows unto 'God, and that their baptism bindeth them not to a 'new course of Life, if People judge themselves free 'from their baptismal Obligation. O! How naked 'come they to Satans Temptations, &c.

Ans. I answer, if you take an offence at us, because we cast away an humane Tradition, we cannot help that, ought we to obey Man rather than God, Judge ye.

2. 'Tis the force of Scripture arguments, or the power of Gods Word, that provoked us, and many Thousands more to throw off the Innovation and sinful practice of Infant Baptism; and dare you say it was Satan that tempted us, no I fear 'tis Satan or worldly profit, or to free themselves from reproach, that tempts some of the *pedobaptists* to continue the practice of that devised Custom. 'Tis not Satans use, nor interest to tempt Men to own Christs blessed Institutions, and cast off Mens Inventions, but endeavour to keep them Ignorant of the first, and to hold up the second, which was let in us in the time of the *Apostacy of the Church*, which 'tis evident is a Pillar to uphold National Churches, and not only Popish, but some Protestant Constitutions also.

3. We are not tempted by Satan, but perswaded by the Lord, and through the Power and Authority of his Word, to believe that God brought us not under that Vow or Obligation in Infancy, tho' you 'tis true do it, and so do the Papists, bring People under Vows and Obligations to live a single Life; and do other things, all tending to Piety and Holyness, (as they tell you,) but God never brought them under any such Vows or Obligations.

And tho' an human Obligation may have some force on the Conscience, especially when People think 'tis Gods Covenant, yet ought not the blind People among the *Papists* to be told that those Covenants are Human, and not Covenants God brought them under? Hath not
God

God ways enough, and such that are sufficient to Oblidge our Children to die to Sin, and live a new Life? but doth he need Man's Supplements, shall man teach God? and will you Father your Baptismal Obligation on God, as that which he requires Infants to come under without the least Shaddow of proof from his blessed Word. I must tell you all *voluntary* Vows are by Christ in the times of the Gospel forbid, *Mat. 5. 33, 34.* You ought not to bring your selves nor Children under any such *voluntary* and *promisory* Oaths, Vows, or Obligations; you must see you are Commanded to do it, or have clear Authority from the Lord to do this thing before you do it. God doth require Believers and their Children when they believe, to come under a baptismal Vow or Obligation, but not till then.

But do not think the purport of our Doctrine herein, is to open a Door for young People to Sin, God forbid; the Obligations which God in his Word, and godly Parents, and Ministers by the authority of God's Word lay upon them are sufficient, when the Lord works with them to oblige them to repent, believe, and lead a new Life, without your volunrary and unwarrantable Obligation laid upon them in Infancy, that you have no ground to believe God will ever blese, to the end you design it, unless he had commanded it; *will you do Evil that Good may come on it.*

8. 'Baptizing by dipping the whole Body into cold Water (as you say) in these cold Climates, is a breach of the sixth Commandment. *Thou shalt not kill*, for 'it is certain, that many tender and sickly Bodies cannot suffer to be dipped in cold Water in the time of 'Winter, without being pernicious to their Lives, especially when it is Snow and Frost; we are not to 'tempt the Lord, thinking that God will do Miracles for the saving of our Lives, he worketh ordinarily 'through appointed means, in such an occasion as this. 'Mr. *Cradock* judged, that the chief Magistrate should 'hinder People to be dipped, least it should be pernicious to the Subjects. *Lib. page 108.*

Ans. I answer, this is a high charge, you accuse us of Murther directly, in breaking the Sixth Commandment, but you forget how hereby you positively break the

the Ninth Commandment, *Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy Neighbour*, Exod. 20. 16. prove what you say, or else with deep sorrow confess your abominable and false accusation; Do you know for certain that any one Person, either Man or Woman, was ever killed, or came to any hurt, that was baptized, that is dipped, *in the Name of the Father, Son and Holy Spirit, in cold winterly weather?* you must produce your witnesses, or you are horribly guilty in the sight of God and Man; you say, *'Tis certain that many tender and sickly Bodies cannot suffer to be Dipped in cold Water, without being pernicious to their Lives, &c.*

Sir, I have my self baptized many hundreds of Men and Women, and some at all times of the year, yea in times of bitter Frost and Snow, when the Ice was first broken, and Persons that were of a weak sickly Constitution, and Women big with Child, and others near Seventy years Old, yea some near Eighty years Old, and I never knew any to suffer the least harm thereby, but many have found their Health better afterward: Yea I heard a Reverend Minister very lately say, that he knew an Ancient Woman in Kent that was Bed-ridden for some time, who could not be satisfied until she was baptized, and baptized she was, and upon it grew strong and went about, and lived some years after in Health and Strength according to her age; also for the space of forty years, I have heard of, or known some Thousands baptized at all Seasons of the year, of both Sex, and never heard of any that received the least prejudice to their Health thereby, much less that it cost them their Lives: Therefore palpable it is you are guilty of *slander, back-biting, and abominable calumny*, bearing false Witness against your Innocent Neighbours, and 'tis well if it be not out of malice, and that not only to us, but also to Christ's Holy Ordinance of Dipping Believers in his Name.

2. But the worst is behind, who is it you cast this reproach upon? Is it upon us? Or is it not upon Christ himself? Did not our Lord Jesus Institute this Ordinance of Baptizing, *i. e.* of dipping the Bodies of Men and Women in water? Sir were not those Men and Women that were Baptized in the Apostolical times Dipped? Do you descent from all the *Ancient and Modern*

Divines; I have Quoted a multitude of them in this Treatise, who positively assert this matter, to which Chapter I refer my Reader.

Ambrose saith, water is that wherein the Body is plunged.

Chrysostom saith, That the Body baptized is burried in the Water. *Basil the Great*, and *Dr. du Veil* say the same.

Bernard saith, Immersion is a representation of Death and Burial.

The Assembly in their Annotations say, That the Ancient manner of Baptizing was, to Dip the Party baptized, and as it were, bury them under the Water.

See *Pools Annotat.* On *Mat. 3. 6.* and were baptized of him in *Jordan*, that is (saith he) Dipped in *Jordan*; and on *Rom. 6. 34.* he says, The Ancient manner of baptizing in those warm Countreys was to Dip or plunge the party baptized.

Cajetan, Daille On the Fathers, *Tilenus, Luther, Calvin, Perkins, Zanchy, Pareus, Dr. Cave, Dr. Sharp, Dr. Fowler, Dr. Sherlock*, the Three last are yet living, and many more I have Quoted, do all say Baptizing is Dipping.

Dr. Tillotson late Bishop of *Canterbury* saith, *That anciently those who were baptized put off their Cloaths, and were immersed and buryed in the Water.*

* Read the Table of the Authors at the beginning of this Book.

* Now Sir, if to baptize by Dipping be Murther, do not you charge the occasion of this Murther upon Christ, who Ordained baptism or dipping Men and Women in Water what work have you made for

Repentance?

Obj. May be you will object, and say that you own that baptism was dipping in those warm Climates.

1. Answ. Did not our Saviour send his Disciples into all the World, or to Teach all Nations, baptizing them, that is Dipping them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

2. Did he send them with this Commission only into warm Climates or Countreys, and not into cold Countreys, God forbid, for there is no other Commission given by Christ to make Disciples by Teaching them, and then to baptize them, but this only, doth not this Commission reach *England*, were all cold Countreys excluded?

3. Did

3. Did Christ give out two Commissions, one for warm Climates, and to Dip them, &c. and another for cold Countreys to Teach and Sprinkle them, or rather Sprinkle them, and then Teach them; for so your practice inverts the Order of Christ's great Commission; did Christ say go into Hot Countreys, and Teach and Baptize Disciples, and go into Cold Countreys and Teach and Rantize them? What an imperfect Commission doth your practice render the Commission of Christ to be.

4. Who gave Men power to change his Commission, Baptizing into Rantizing or Sprinkling? What an account can you give to him of this at the great Day? Or hath the *Church* or *Ministers*, power to alter Christ's great Commission? and so alter, or add too, and diminish from the words of his Book; Sir, tremble at the thoughts of these things, See *Rev.* 22, 18.

As to Mr. *Cradock* it seems, if he hath wrote as you intimate, that he was under great temptation; but 'tis no marvel, we can tell you of some Men; and of as great a Name as he that would have the Anabaptists; and Independants too, to have no liberty to meet together, to Preach nor write Books, and would have the chief Magistrate to Imprison and Banish them, &c.

Obj. Where as you bring in this as your Objection, they may tarry until Summer.

1. We answer, there is no need of that, because what you speak of the danger of baptizing in Winter is absolutely false.

2. I know not, but there may be as many or more baptized in the Winter than in the Summer.

You say, as soon as they are made Disciples, they are commanded to be baptized, *Acts* 24. 41. and *ch.* 8. 38.

Ans. This is our practice, but why do not you stay till then, *i. e.* untill your Children are Disciples, it is evil to stay longer then the time, and no evil to do it sooner then the time Christ hath appointed.

9. 'This form of Baptizing by Dipping of the People naked, or near naked, you say, is a breach of the Seventh Commandment, *Thou shalt not commit adultery*, *Mat.* 5. 28. This Commandment prohibiteth not only the Act of Adultery, but every occasion

‘ and provocation thereto; every immodest and un-
 ‘ verend Action, is a degree of Adultery, the Heart
 ‘ of Man is deceitful and desperately wicked, *Jer. 17. 9.*
 ‘ therefore we ought to take heed of every occasion of
 ‘ Sin. *David* fell into Adultery by beholding *Bathsheba*
 ‘ washing, *Ec. 2 Sam. 11. 2.* Thus we see that God would
 ‘ not have his People be naked in the Congregation, or
 ‘ half naked, for there is but little difference between
 ‘ both, *Exod. 20. 26.* and *ch. 28. 42.* but they that re-
 ‘ baptize by Dipping the People in publick, put off
 ‘ the greatest part of their Cloaths; the re-baptizer,
 ‘ and He or She that is baptized is near naked, which
 ‘ might be a temptation to him that is the Baptizer, and
 ‘ to the Spectators, if the temptation will not take hold on
 ‘ the Minister, who is but Flesh and Blood as others are,
 ‘ such a behaviour before a mixt Congregation, brings
 ‘ him under a reproach, and maketh the worship of
 ‘ God contemptible.

1. *Ans.* I answer, I am grieved that a Minister,
 and I hope a godly Man, should be thus left to himself,
 or be under no better conduct about this matter, but
 thus to add sin to sin, whilst he writes about divine
 things.

2. Pray Mr. *Owen*, what is the purport of your
 Charge now in recriminating and vilifying the Sacred
 Ordinance of Dipping or Baptizing of Believers, this
 Odium must fall as well on the Primitive Churches and
 Holy Apostles as upon us, you see all your Brethren ge-
 nerally as one Man, say the whole assembly of Divines
 affirm that in the Primitive times the manner of bap-
 tizing, was by dipping of the Body all over in Water,
 tho’ they would restrain it to those *Hot Countreys*. Will
 you charge the Holy Apostles, and all the Ministers of
 the Primitive Churches with *Adultery*? Or do you
 think we in these *Cold Climates* have not convenient
 Cloaths to put on People that are to be baptized, as they
 had in those *Warm Countreys*.

3. But if this was all, it were not so sad altogether;
 for it was our Lord Jesus, worthy *Britains*, who Orda-
 ined and appointed Men and Women, who are Believers
 to be Dipped in the Water *in his Name*; and ’tis a hard
 case there is no way to answer this holy Command and
 Ordinance, but the People that do it must be guilty of

Adultery;

Adultery; must we go into the water naked or half naked? Is there a necessity for it? Are there no Cloaths to be had, or no modest Garments for Men and Women to be provided to cover all their nakedness, even Hands and Feet also if it be needful? sure Sir, you must suppose somewhat of this kind, or there is no room left for you to cast contempt and reproach upon the Ordinance it self, but to blame the people they do not provide convenient Garments on purpose, that so they may not *commit Adultery* when they come to be Baptized.

4. Sir had you seen our People baptized you, had not been guilty of bearing false witness the Second time. Reader pray take notice that we provide comely Cloaths for the Administrer, both from Head to Foot; and our Men also that are baptized have Cloaths provided for them; and for the Women, Gowns and Petty-coats are made on purpose, and they go into the water dressed more decently *perhaps*, then many Women come into Christian assemblies; therefore this is a most unworthy Charge Mr. Owen casts upon us, tho' he doth but follow the steps of Dr. Featly and Mr. B. but 'tis worse in him at this time of the Day, then in them then, because our use and practice here, is now more generally known: And these things being so, how can we in Dipping or Baptizing of Women be guilty of *Adultery* or any of the Spectators?

Can't you take a Woman dressed in modest and decent Cloaths by the Hand, without having an unclean thought in your Heart? you may as well charge some Tradesmen in the Exercise of their Trades with *Adultery*; indeed did we as Mr. B. — once falsely said, baptize Women naked, or as you say, near or half naked (which are both notorious untruths) there might have been some colour for what you say; but if there be need to Dip the whole Body (say you) as they say there is, what rule have they in the Scripture to baptize the Cloaths with the Body, the few Cloaths they have about them are dipped before the Body is dipped.

1. *Ans.* All Men may perceive of what a contentious, contradicting quarelsome Spirit you are of, one while you strive to expose Christ's Sacred Ordinance

to reproach, and us with it, as if we baptized Persons naked, and then presently seem to allow that we do not so, but that they whom we baptize have Cloaths on, but now the Cloaths are baptized, and then ask what Scripture we have for this.

2. 'Tis enough Christ Commanded Dipping in his Name, and we are required to *do all things decently*. 'Tis no matter, so that the Body is buried in the Water 'tis not the Cloaths that we say we baptize, but the Person. Christs Ordinance of Baptism in one essential part lies in the words of Administration, Do you never Sprinkle some drops of Water on the Childs *Fine dresses*, if you should, what doth that signifie? you have wrote *hard words*, and Christ is coming to convince *all of their ungodly deeds, and of all their hard Speeches spoken against him*, Jude 15. I pray God this Sin be not laid to your *Charge*. Thus I have been helped to take off that reproach and vile slanders cast upon the baptizing Believers, and have proved it is not re-baptization; therefore let Mr. Owen cast of his slanderous clamorous Pen, and *Infants Rhamism*, and repent and return to the Baptism which Christ Instituted, and left in his Church to the end of the World; and now to make appear the evil and sinfulness of Infant Baptism, take what follows, which I have transcribed out of my answer to Mr. Burkitt's Book that he wrote for the Baptizing of Children two or three years since.

C H A P. XXI.

Shewing that there is no Blessing to be expected in Baptizing Infants, but rather the displeasure of the Jealous God, demonstrating contrarywise to what Mr. James Owen hath said (also Mr. Burkit and Mr. Daniel Williams, and all other pedit-baptists,) that it is a very sinful and an unlawful practice.

AS Mr. Owen hath laboured in vain to shew the usefulness of Infant Baptism, so Mr. Burkit a Learned Minister of the Church of England, who in his late Treatise for Infant Baptism also did, see page 35, 36, 37, 38. of his Book.

1. Mr. Burkit saith *Children are hereby Interested in all the prayers of the Church.*

1. *Answ.* If you pray for them as Members of the visible Church, what ground have you to do from Gods word, since God in the Gospel times had not made them Members thereof.

2. Can't we pray for our Children, tho' as yet they are not Members, that they may become Members thereof.

2. He saith, *by vertue of this admission, they have interest in the special providence of God.*

Answ. No doubt but God doth exercise his special Care and Providence over all Elect Infants, but not the more for your baptizing them without his authority, or Command, much less Infants of Believers as such.

3. He says, *Hereby the Church stands nearer to them than to the rest of mankind, &c. mentioning that Text, Isa. 54. 13. Thy Children shall be all taught of God.*

1. *Answ.* Neither you nor Mr. Burkit nor any pedit-baptists in the World can bring Infants nearer to God, nor his Church by any act done by you without any rule left by Christ.

2. Does that Text, *Isa. 54. 13. refer to Infants of Belie-*

Believers as such, or to those godly and new re-born Children, who being born in sin, are indeed her Spiritual Children.

4. He saith, *Infant Baptism is an act of Dedication, &c.*

Ans. Who commanded you this way to Dedicate your Children to the Lord? Will you Teach the Almighty, or are you wiser than he? Doth he in his word require you so to do.

2. May not the *Papists* say as well, that those Persons they bring under their voluntary Vows, are thereby Dedicated unto God?

3. *Mr. Burkit* saith, 'Tis great advantage to Infants, as 'tis an Act of stipulation; that is, saith he, a Child at baptism enters into Covenant with God.

Ans. I answer, Poor Babes, 'tis without their knowledge and consent, or God's appointment, which is worst of all, or they being able to perform it then, nor many of them ever after, God never giving them his Grace so to do. But wo to them if they do not perform this Covenant, if *Mr. Burkit* and

Mr. Daniel Williams say true; he says in his Catechism as followeth, *That those Children who perform not their Baptismal Covenant do.*

1. They reject Christ, 2d. They renounce the Blessings of the Gospel. 3dly. that 'tis Rebellion against their Maker. 4thly. That 'tis ingratitude and perjury against their Redeemer. 5thly. Gross injustice to their Parents. 6thly. That 'tis self-killing Cruelty to their own Souls. 7thly. 'Tis (he saith) a damning Sin, nay its the heart of all Sin.

Is this indeed the love you *Pedo-baptists* have to your poor Infants. What bring them into such a Covenant, without their knowledge and consent, or God's appointment, and then threaten them if they break it, with Hell and Damnation, and what not?

Do you know they are all Elect Persons, and so such that God will in time call, give grace to, and so change their evil and depraved Natures? if not, do you not heap up a multitude of evils upon them, and hereby make their condition worse, or aggravate their Sin and misery for ever.

I know not whether you be of this Pedo-baptists mind, or not, but I think this Doctrine does not fit a Christian Catechism? If God had required Infants to enter into such Covenant, some reason he might have thus to speak; But since neither he nor you can prove it; This to me seems a daring boldness in a Minister of the Gospel to assert, (who I hope is a good Man) God (I grant) expects, that all true believers should perform their Baptismal Covenant, but then know, they are required of God actually to enter into it, & they freely of their own choice enter into it; also they are such God hath given habitual Grace to perform it; And he hath promised them also a farther supply of Grace to enable them so to do; but nothing of this you can prove in Infants Covenanting in their Baptism, (but more of this by and by) nor will their Sureties help the matter; for if they cannot perform those things they promise for themselves, how should they be able to do it for others? besides 'tis an humane Invention, and not appointed of God.

*Mr. Williams
Worthy of blame
as well as Mr.
Burkit.*

But truly Mr. Williams's Doctrine afflicts my Mind: Strange! is this Sin the damning Sin? I thought the damning Sin (by way of eminency) had been the Sin of unbelief. Suppose your own Child should not believe, he is bound by vertue of that Baptismal Covenant you brought him into, but when grown up, disowns that (you call) Baptism, &c. for his not believing 'tis a Truth of Christ, must he be damned?

But to proceed;

Mr. Burkit having shewed the advantages of Infant Baptism, without giving one Scripture Text to prove what he says is true; he in Page 38. comes to shew, that Baptism is more useful and beneficial to a Child in Infancy, then to omit it till riper Age; because no Infant Membership is capable of Hypocrisy, which Persons grown up are.

I. *Ans.* Then give them the Lords Supper also, for doubtless if they receive it, they will not eat and drink their own damnation, as may be some that have it given to them, do. I tremble at what you dare to say and write, in which you seem to arraign the Wisdom

dom of the ever blessed Jesus who he hath appointed believers or Adult persons, who are gracious to be Baptized, and none else; and do you say, the Ordinance better suites with the Ignorant Babes? should you dictate to your Earthly Prince, would he allow it? much less to contradict or Correct him, as if your Wisdom were more then his.

2. Mr. *Burkitt* sayth, 'tis more advantageous to Infants, than those of riper years; as it is a pre-engagement upon them to resist Temptations.

Ans. He may after this rate bring them under an hundred Engagements and Covenants, which may be more plausible ones too: may you not when they know what they do, make them take a Solemn Oath? or enter into Bonds upon pain of severe Punishment, that they shall not yield to Temptations, and pretend 'tis God's Law they should do so, which if you can deceive their judgments, they will dread as much, (nay it may be more) the breaking those Oaths and Covenants, then this you bring them into, without any authority from Jesus Christ.

3. Mr. *Burkitt* saith, Baptism in Infancy is more advantageous then at riper years, as it is an early remedy against the malady of Original sin.

Ans. Speak, Doth Baptism take away Original sin, or free them from that Malady or not? you know some of the Ancient Fathers were carryed away with such a dream; how comes it to pass then, that this contagion appears so soon, and to be as strong in your Children as in ours, who never were Baptized at all? But does not St. Peter tell you (1. Pet. 3. 20.) *Baptism washes not away the filth of the Flesh*; Or is not Original Pollution a filth of the Flesh? What stuff is this you would force upon us and the World? we affirm Infants are no more capable of this Ordinance then any other. Why do you say of no Right but this? we challenge all the World by God's Word, to prove that they are capable of Baptism, any more then of the Lords Supper.

4. He says Baptism Administred to Infants has this advantage, it puts the Christian upon more bitter mourning for actual Sin, from that consideration of that shameful Perjury and wilful Apostacy that is found in such Persons sins.

Ans.

Ans. He is I find one of Mr. Williams's Brethren, i. e. he is of his belief it seems, but tremble at the thoughts of the Consequences of your Doctrine. Have not your Children whengrown up, enough sins to mourn for and bewail before the Almighty God, but you must bring them into a Covenant which you know they would break when they come to riper Age? and such is the pravity of Human Nature, that there is no avoiding of it without a supernatural work of Grace; their Burden is heavy enough, you need not add to it.

The danger of Infants Baptismal Covenant layd open.

2. Is it not sad, that Men should give cause to their Children to think they are guilty of Perjury? when in truth they never were, nor of Apostacy from God upon that account. Our first Apostacy was bad enough, you need not go about to make them guilty of another. Alas! their pretended baptism never brought them one step nearer to God, then those Children are, who were never Baptized in their Infancy at all, where then is the Apostacy he speaks of.

3. You hereby bring them under necessity of committing the Sin of Perjury, and of Apostacy, at leastwise in your own conceit, and in others too, if they can believe what this Man says, and so to cause them to mourn for that, or those sins most, which may be (if all things were rightly considered) are no sins at all. I do not mean that any of the actual transgressions may not be sin; but that they are not guilty of Perjury and Apostacy, by breaking that you call their Baptismal Covenant: For if God brought them not into that Covenant, nor into any Covenant relation with himself thereby, I cannot see how there should be such a sting in the Tayl of it, as he affirms, and indeed, had they themselves, of their own accord and consent, entered into an unlawful or an unwarrantable Covenant which they were no ways able to perform, it may be doubted whether it would be Perjury in them if they kept it not, besides, I hope they have not forsworn themselves, how then is it Perjury?

4. Moreover, I desire all those Parents who baptize their Children, and you also, to consider in the fear of God,

God, the natural tendency and Consequences of your bringing poor Babes into such a Covenant.

1. That you force them to enter into this Covenant without any Authority or Command from God; for I challenge you and all pedobaptists in the World to prove God hath any where directly or indirectly, required any such thing at your Hands.

2. Consider that 'tis not only a reformation of Life, or a bare refraining from the gross acts of sin, that you assert, is comprehended in this Baptismal Covenant, you cause Infants to enter into; but it is Regeneration it self, *i. e.* a change of Heart, and savingly to believe in Christ; this you oblige your poor Babes to perform. Now what Arminianism is here fomented, if once you say or think, they are capable to perform this Obligation? but if they do not do it, 'twill be to them.

Moreover what guilt do those of the Church of *England* bring their poor Sureties under, unless they stand obliged no longer then the Child abides in Infancy; and if so, what need of their Obligation at all, if they intend no more.

3. Consider, you brought them into this Covenant without their knowledge and consent, they never subscribed to it, nor knew any thing of it, nor were they capable so to do.

4. Consider, that whatsoever you think, that such is the pravity of their natures, by means of our first Apostacy from God, or Original Sin, that they do and must of necessity break it, as I said before, unless God should by supernatural Grace, change their Hearts and Nature, and remove the vicious habits thereof, which you had not the least ground to believe he would do, or leastwise to all or the greatest part of them, God having made no such promise; and by woful experience, we daily see many, or most of those Children, are never converted, but from the Womb go astray, and are guilty of almost all manner of abominable sins, and so live and dye.

As to the Adult.

1. Consider as I said before,

1. That all Believers, God himself doth require or Command in his Word to enter into this Baptismal Covenant.

2. And

2. And they before they enter into it, have a principle of divine life infused into their Soul; or Grace implanted in their Hearts, having passed under the work of Regeneration, being dead to Sin (of which Baptism is a lively Symbol) or is as your Church says, an outward sign of an inward spiritual Grace. Not as Mr. *Baxter* observes, a Sign or Symbol of future, but of present Regeneration, which is confirmed by what *St Paul* Teaches, *Rom. 6. 3, 4.*

2. How shall we that are dead to sin live any longer therein? not may be dead, but are dead, and so Buried with Christ in Baptism, *verse 3. 4.* If you say all Adult Persons Baptized are not Converted, I answer, they appear so to be, and as such voluntarily enter into this Covenant: Besides God does not require them without Faith to do it. Baptism doth not only represent the Death and Burial of Christ, but also signifies our Death to Sin, or that Blessed work of Mortification or the remainder of the Body of Sin and Death, by which means Believers who enter into this Baptismal Covenant are put into a Gracious and Meet Capacity to perform that Sacred Obligation; but so are not Infants.

3. That every true believer baptized, considers, ponders upon, and weighs with all seriousness and deliberation Imaginable, the nature of this Covenant before he Signs it. And

4. That he doth it freely and voluntarily, and with his full liking, approbation and Consent, neither of which do, nor can do those poor Infants you force to enter into this Covenant. These things consider'd, it appears, as it is a sinful Act in you to bring them into this Covenant (since 'tis done without Command or Authority from God) so 'tis cruelty also towards your own Babes, by making them to become guilty of Perjury, and thereby damning. (as Mr. *Williams* says) their own Souls.

5. Consider every true Believer that is listed under Christ's Banner, by entering into this Baptismal Covenant, is by Christ compleatly armed, *i. e.* he hath the Christian Armour put upon him, *Ephes. 6.* He hath the Breast-plate of Righteousness, the Shield of Faith, and for a Helmet, the hope of Salvation; and the Word of God, like a Sword in his Hand, to cut down all his Enemies.

emies. Thus by the help of these Sacred Graces of the Spirit, he is enabled to fight against Sin, the World, the Flesh, and the Devil. But alas! you list your poor Babes into this War, and make them Covenant and Vow to forsake the Devil and all his Works, the Pumps and Vanities of this wicked World, and all the sinful lusts of the Flesh, but Arm them not. Did Baptism confer Grace and Arm their Souls, it was something, but who dares assert that? Or if he does, who will or can believe him.

6. God hath also promised to assist, stand by, help and enable all Believers Baptized, with farther supplies of Grace, nay, they being actually United to Christ, have his blessed influences flowing to them, besides the promises of God, the Death, Resurrection and Intercession of Christ, and the everlasting Covenant of Grace, which is ordered in all things, and sure, firmly secures all their Souls. But thus it is not with those poor Babes you bring into this Covenant: You are like *Pharaohs Task-masters, Command the making Bricks, but allow them no Straw.*

4. Again consider, how hereby, great part of the Nations are perjur'd. I will appeal to the Consciences of all thinking and understanding People, whether according to your principle and practice, it is not so. Mourn O *England* and lament, sad is thy Case? If these Men speak right or truly, what a multitude in thee have been made to enter into this Covenant, who never performed it. O Perjur'd Nation, Perjur'd People, and Perjur'd Pastors, for so are all thy Debauched, Drunken, Swearing and unclean Teachers, are not these Perjur'd also? Have they kept their Vow and Covenant? Alas! instead of Mourning for this Sin, we may conclude they never thought of it. But let them break off their sins by Righteousness, I mean repent, and leave those gross acts of Wickedness, of which many, both Priests and People are guilty, and get renewing Grace, and never let them fear this new devised sin of Perjury: For if God's Word convinces of all Sins, and doth not convince of this sort of Perjury, this is no Perjury; (I mean the simple breaking of that Covenant) tho' those sins by which they are said to break it, are horrid Treason and Rebellion against the God of Heaven,

ven, and provoke him to wrath every day. But God's word doth convince of all Sin, but doth not convince of this sort of Perjury, as is affirmed. 'Tis not this which is the Self killing Murther, the damnable Sin; No no, but 'tis their unbelief, and contempt of God's Grace, or neglecting the great Salvation offer'd unto us by Christ in the Gospel.

5. Baptism administred in Infancy, hath, saith Mr. *Burkin*, this singular advantage above that which is administred at riper Age, in that it gives the pious Parent a good Ground and Hope that his Children dying in Infancy, are certainly saved, it makes (say you) that Ordinance a Channel of Grace, &c.

1. *Ans.* This is like to the rest. But Sir, by what Authority do you assert all these things? You know what wonderful Vertue the Papists say, is in many of their Popish Rites, Ceremonies and Reliques, *i. e.* in their crossing of themselves, and in their Holy-water, especially in their *Agms Dei*. But how do they prove it? Even as well as you do, what you speak here upon this account, and we have the same reason to believe them, as to believe you in what you speak, without Proof or Authority from God's word.

2. Pious Parents! But alas, how few are there of that sort? but what hope have the Impious, Prophane, and ungodly Parent of the Salvation of his dying Children? But Sir, I thought all the Pious and Believing or Godly Parents Children, were born in Covenant with God, that their Parents Faith would have secured them, whether Baptized or not, were not the *Jews* Female Children saved? they were not Circumcised; And were not their Male Infants saved, who dyed before the Eighth Day?

3. From what Scripture is it, these Pious, though Ignorant and deceiv'd Parents, may have hope that their Children that dye in their Infancy shall be saved, and none but theirs that are Baptized, or rather Rantified.

4. Will Pedit-Baptists make Baptism their Saviour? Can Baptism save them, And is it so indeed? Is it in the power of Parents to save or damn their Children? And how came Baptism to have such power in it? or who made that a Channel of Grace to dying

dying Infants? Do you not place that Virtue in an external Rite, that only belongs to the Blood of Christ, and sanctifying Grace of God's Spirit?

* *Perkins on Gal.* c. 3. p. 256. rit? Mr. *Perkins* * saith, That Baptism indeed saveth, but saith

he, that is not the Baptism of Water, but the stipulation of a good Conscience by the Resurrection. Again he saith, the outward Baptism without the inward, is no mark of God's Child; but the mark of a Fool, that makes a Vow, and afterwards breaks it.

5. May not this Doctrine of theirs, clearly tend to scare and affright poor Parents with fear, that all their Babes that dye in their Mothers Womb, or before baptized, are damned? And Oh, in what a sad Condition are all the Children of the ungodly and impious Persons, whose little Babes you dare not, cannot Baptise, if you are true to your own Principles? But that Text may give us better ground of Hopes a Thousand times, concerning the well being of our dying Infants, where our Saviour saith, *for of such are the Kingdom of Heaven*; and that also which you mention, *I shall go to him, he shall not return to me*; together with the infinite Mercy of God, through the virtue of Christ's Blood, who can convey help and healing to dying Infants and Ideots, in ways we know not of, nor are we to trouble our Selves about such secret things that are not revealed.

6. Mr. *Burkitt* saith, the practice of Infant Baptism appears most beneficial, because it prevents such shameful and scandalous neglects of Baptism, to the blemish of Christianity.

Ans. Is it then a shameful scandal to neglect a Tradition of Man? (For so I have proved Infant Baptism to be) Where is the shame that ought to be in Christians, that Christ's Laws and Precepts are neglected, and his precious Ordinance of Baptism exposed to Contempt and Shame, as it is by you and Thousands more, whilst the Statutes of *Omri* are zealously kept and observed, as the Prophet of old complained; I mean humane Rites and Traditions or Statutes, (like those of *Omri*; instituted by him and *Jeroboam*) which the Wisdom of your Church, and many corrupt Churches

t
t
l
a
i
n
a
t
t
o
f
n
t
i
n
f
f
n
a

ches have been zealous for to this day; and thus I have run through and examined Mr. *Burkitts* Six particulars, which he brought to prove the usefulness of Infant Baptism, above the baptism of Believers, which our Blessed Saviour Instituted; and now shall shew you further that Infant Baptism is so far from being more useful then that of the Adult, that it is a palpable error, and therefore of no use at all, but the contrary, viz. a very sinful thing.

Reader, can that be useful, or any ways beneficial which Christ never Commanded or required to be done in his Name, but is unrighteously Fathered upon him, to the utter making void his own Ordinance of baptizing Believers?

2. Can that have any usefulness in it, that brings guilt upon the Parents in doing it, making them guilty of Will, Worship, or of a humane Tradition?

3. Can that be useful that brings Babes into such a Covenant, which Christ never Ordained them to enter into, and to which they directly nor indirectly consented nor approved of; and which they are utterly unable to keep; and which giveth them no strength to perform; nor is there one promise of God made to assist or help them to do it, and yet for not keeping of it, they are charged with Perjury, with self Murder, nay, with Hell and Damnation?

4. Can that be of use to Infants that may basely beguile and deceive them, causing them when grown up, to think they were thereby made Christians, and become the Children of God, Members of Christ, and Inhabitants of the Kingdom of Heaven, nay, Regenerated; and from hence never look after any other work of Grace nor Regeneration, but conclude all is well with them?

5. Can that be an usual thing, which the doing of it is a palpable alteration of the words of Christ's Commission, and so inverts that Holy Order left by him for baptizing, who requires none to be baptized before they be first Taught and made Disciples?

6. Can that be of any use to an Infant which you, nor no Man else can prove from Gods Word, to have any use and Blessing in it to them?

7. Can an humane Rite or Tradition, think you, save poor Children, or a little Water sprinkled on the Face, wash away Original Sin? Or will God bless a Tradition of Man.

8. Can Water beget Children to Christ, or can that be useful to them, which they have only the bare sign of, and not the thing signified, *viz.* the Sign of Regeneration, but not Regeneration it self, a sign of Grace, but not Grace it self? you give them the Shell, but no Kernel; the name of a Christian, but no nature of a Christian, making that you call Christ's Baptism, (as Dr. Taylor saith,) a sign without effect, and like the Fig-tree in the Gospel, full of Leaves, but no Fruit.

9. Can that be useful that tends to make the Gospel Church National, (and confounds the Church and the World together) which ought to be Congregational, a holy and separate People, like a Garden enclosed?

10. Can Baptism be more useful to Infants then adult Believers, notwithstanding the Scripture saith, that the Person baptized, doth not only believe, but call upon the name of the Lord, *Acts* 22. 16. Can Infants do that?

11. Can Infant Baptism be more useful then that of Believers, and yet Baptism an Ordinance of the Souls Marriage with Christ? and is not that (as Mr. Baxter saith,) a strange Marriage, where there is nothing signified of consent? and are Infants able so to do?

12. Can Infant Baptism be more useful then that of Believers, and yet Baptism call'd the Answer of a good Conscience? Can a little Babe answer a good Conscience by being baptized in Obedience to Christ, and to shew forth his Death and Resurrection?

13. Can Infant Baptism be more useful then that of Believers? Whereas the first has no promise of God made unto it, and yet the other hath many, as *Acts* 2. 36, 37, 38. *Mark* 16. 16.

14. Can that be an useful thing that frustrates the Sacred and Spiritual ends of Baptism? which we have shewed are many, but as administered to poor Babes, 'tis rendred wholly of none effect, and an insignificant thing.

Mr. Perkins hints that Baptism signifies two things, (1) our Union with Christ, (2) our Communion with him, now how does this appear in Infants as such, as it does in Believers; Perkins on Gal. p. 265.

16. Is not that an absurd Doctrine and Practice that renders the fruitful Womb of a godly Woman, more advantageous to increase the Church of Christ, than a fruitful Gospel.

17. Is it not a very absurd thing to say, that *Abraham* could by his Money, purchase and bring Strangers and proselyted Gentiles into the Covenant of Grace, and if *Abraham* could buy them and bring them into the Covenant of Grace with Silver and Gold, what need was there of Jesus Christ to buy or purchase them with his own Blood?

18. Is not that an absurd Doctrine and Practice that holds forth, that godly Parents have power to bring in their Children into the Covenant of Grace, or keep them out of it? for if you by baptizing them do not bring them into the Covenant of Grace, but you do believe they were in the said Covenant by being born of Believers, by being begotten by you according to the Flesh, then it will follow, if we are Believers, our Children are in as good a Condition as yours, though they were never baptized.

C H A P. XXII.

In Answer to Mr. James Owen's 18th. Chapter, wherein he sheweth the Duty of Parents to their Children, proving in opposition to what he says, that Parents ought not to consecrate their Infants to the Lord by Baptism.

YOU say, if Parents would perform their Duties towards their Children, and how to make a right use of their Baptism, there would be more Godliness and Sobriety in the Country, and few would be the number of them that deny their Baptism, &c.

Ans. If Parents did generally take more care of their Childrens Souls, and instruct them in the Principles of the Christian Religion then they do, no doubt Sobriety and Godliness would more abound then now it doth every where.

2. But as to the right use of their Baptism, you your Selves cannot tell what use that can be to them, because 'tis not appointed of God.

3. Did Parents instruct their Children according to the word of God, *viz.* to believe and get Union with Christ, and not baptize them till they desired it, according to the Scripture, Infant Baptism would soon vanquish.

(1.) ' You say look to your own right in the Covenant of God, if God is not a God to you, he is not a God to your Seed, &c.

1. *Ans.* Suppose then that some of those Parents whose Children you baptize, should not be in Covenant with God, what right had their Children to Baptism, is not that Baptism a nullity; it was not thus in the case of Circumcision, if the Parents were *Abraham's* natural Seed, whether Godly or wicked, they were to Circumcise their Male Children.

2. Though

2. Though 'tis true, an adult Person hath no right to Baptism that is not a true believer, yet if he profess Faith in Christ, and a Minister not knowing his Heart; but sees no cause to doubt of the reality or truth of his Faith, he may baptize such; but you have no Warrant to baptize a Child upon the profession of its Parents Faith, tho' his Faith be sincere.

2. When they are Born prepare to Present and Consecrate them (say you) to the Lord through the 'Sacred Ordinance of Baptism, there are many that baptize all their Children as matter of Ceremony, and meer Custom without looking to the Lord, &c.

Ans. By whose Authority must they thus do, viz. As soon as their Children are Born, Consecrate them to the Lord. 'Tis not by the Authority of God's Word, therefore a piece of Will Worship. Parents would do well to pray over their Babes, as soon as they are Born, but unless required by Christ to baptize them, they must not do that.

2. Whoever therefore Baptize their Infants, do it only as a Ceremony devised by Man tho' not in their intention, their Consciences being misled.

'You ought (say you) to be serious about their Baptism, as we should be about our own baptism; that which the Child ought to do, if he had been at Age and Understanding, must be done by you for them, even as Mothers when their Children be Sick, take Physick themselves, which the Children ought to take, so that the Child may have the Medicine in his Mothers Milk, even so do ye that which the Child ought to do, if he had been of Age before Baptized.

1. *Ans.* Some of the Papists are very serious about their devised Ceremonies, but this makes it in no wise the more acceptable to God. But

2. Do you not here seemingly acknowledge 'tis the Duty of the Child when 'tis at Age to be baptized, but you would have its Parents do it for the Child; but how do you prove that God will accept that at the Hands of the Parent which the Child ought to do when at Age.

I have shewed you that in an early Council they would not allow a Woman big with Child to be Baptized least it should be thought the Child was baptized with the Mother.

3. Doth the Mothers Faith, and Holiness, avail and profit their Childs Soul, as her Milk may avail and profit the Body of her Child, what kind of Doctrine is this? but it may be so if what you said before be true, *i. e.* that the Child is part of the Parent.

3. ' Bless the Lord for the Covenant of Grace (say you) and for Christ the Mediator of the Covenant, and for Baptism the Seal of that Covenant; Is the extent of the Covenant, a small thing in thy sight, that the living God bindeth himself to thee and thy sinful Seed? Is it a small thing that he should pitty them when they were polluted in their blood, that he washed them and entred into a Covenant with them, *Ezek. 16. 5, 6.*

1. *Ans.* We have all cause to bless the Lord for the Covenant of Grace, and for Christ the Mediator, both in respect of our selves, and for our Children, but you affirm that which you cannot prove, *viz.* that baptism is the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, for hath the Covenant of Grace any other Seal; that Seals to us all the Blessings of that Covenant, save the Holy Spirit only, the Spirit of God is called a Seal, *Eph. 1. 13, 14. Chap. 4. 30.* but so is not baptism called any where.

2. If all your Children have the Seal of the Covenant of Grace, or all the blessings thereof, sealed up to them, shall they not be all saved? all know a Seal confirms and gives an assurance of all the Priviledges, Blessings, and Profits, that are contained in that Covenant, to which it is prefix'd.

3. You falsly also apply that Text in *Ezek. 16. 5, 6* that is not applicable to our Infants as such, but to God's *Israel* or Believers, who were once like that wretched Infant cast out in its Blood, but God entered into Covenant with us, and washed us, &c. But are all believers Children washed in the Blood of Christ, no doubt they are in the Covenant of Grace that go to Heaven, that die in Infancy; but the rest remain polluted, in their Original, and actual pollution until they believe in Christ Jesus, and are regenerated by Divine Grace, tho' they are baptized, for that washeth them not.

4. Set

4. 'Set time a part (say you) for earnest praying, praying to the Lord for to forgive the Sins of your Child to Sanctifie his Nature, and bless the Ordinance of Baptism unto him, &c.

Ans. Prayer is good, and a great Duty 'tis to pray for our Children, but take heed how you pray their baptism may be blessed, since Christ did not appoint any Baptism for them in Infancy; hath he promised any blessing to that, or will he bless an Invention of Men?

5. 'When the Minister doth baptize thy Child, do thou act Faith in God's Covenant, for thy self and thy Child, &c.

Ans. How can you act Faith in doing that which God hath made no promise unto you, or to your Children believers that are baptized may act Faith indeed.

1. Because Christ commandeth them to be baptized, *Mat. 28. 19, 20. Acts 2. 37.*

2. Because he hath promised unto them great blessings in Baptism, *Mark 16. 16. Acts 2. 37, 38.* but there is neither a precept for nor promise made unto Infants Baptized.

1. 'Speedily do it, stay not as Moses did to Circumcise his Child, *Exod. 4. 24.* the which had like to cost him his life, it is true God bindeth us not at this time to the Eighth day as he did the Jews, yet we ought not to delay. *Vid. Cypr. Fidem Ep. 59.*

Ans. Make not more speedy hast then good speed, or more hast then God directeth you, why not delay, since God no where saith on the Eighth Day, nor at a year Old nor three years Old, but when they believe, then they ought to rise indeed and not tarry, and be baptized, but since you have no Scripture for this advise, you Quote *Cyprian*, who would not have the Adult delay if he speaks it of Infants, he is no rule for us, the Ordinance was corrupted in his time, where is it written in Gods Word, *Moses* had a command to Circumcise his Son on the Eighth Day, therefore he ought not to delay longer, but what is this to your case.

2. 'Cheerfully as one Marrieth his Child with the Lord Jesus Christ.

Ans. Cheerfully do it, no do it not at all on your peril

peril. For 'tis as Mr. *Baxter* saith, a strange Marriage where there is nothing of consent.

3. Publickly (say you) before the Congregation.

Answ. And yet not ashamed, shew your authority first.

Your other advice seems tolerable good, save what you speak concerning your Infant Baptism, in Teaching your Children, the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures, and giving them good examples; and in putting them into godly Families; in doing thus you may expect a blessing from God; but none of these things will add any vertue to their Infant Baptism, to make that any ways effectual to them, so much only shall suffice as to our 18th. Chapter.

CHAP. XXIII.

In answer to Mr. James Owens 19th Chapter wherein he gives advice to Children, with an answer to his Queries, that he would have the Anabaptists to reply unto.

Children, bless the Lord for the priviledges of your Baptism, God hath taken you into Covenant (say you) with your Parents, he hath prevented you with the blessings of goodness, and made you nigh, who being by Nature a far off, ye are no more Strangers and Foreigners, but fellow Citizens with the Saints and the Household of God, *Eph* 2. 19.

1. *Answ.* Must they bless God that their Parents deceived them with false hopes of priviledges, which neither they nor your selves know what they are, or for putting a cheat upon them to make them think their State is better thereby, and yet cannot prove it from Gods Word so to be. How doth God prevent them with blessings of Goodness, by your Rantizing them? doth your pretended baptism infuse grace or gracious

gracious habits unto them, or what to ~~achieve~~, or is the blessings of that Vow you brought them under voluntarily, without any authority from God.

2. Are you not afraid to affirm that Children by their baptism are by the Lord made neer unto him, and made thereby Children of God, who were by Nature Children of Wrath, *and no more Strangers and Foreigners, &c.* If this was so, shall they not be all Saved? Can any thing bring Children near to God, and make them fellow-Heirs and Citizens with the Saints, but a Sacred Work of God's Spirit upon their Souls, and doth your Baptism do this.

2. Can such that are no more Strangers to God, &c. ever perish? Is there a possibility of Final falling from a State of true Grace; and if it be thus ought not your Children to have all the privileges of the Household of God, the Lords Supper, &c.

3. Will you attribute those High and Sublime Privileges that belong to believers, who are only born of the Spirit, to your poor Babes that yet remain Children of Wrath and unrenewed by the Grace of God, is not this a ready way to blind the Eyes of your Children, and ruine their Souls if they should believe you herein.

You are under that Gracious Providence (say you) which watcheth over the Church, &c.

1. *Ans.* You must first prove them Members of the Church; and not only Members, but all of them elected Persons, for they are such Members, that the special Providence of God is over.

2. You say they have a share in the daily prayers that are put up for the Church of God. *Psalms 72. 15. Prayers shall be made for him, and daily shall he be praised. Psalm 51. 13. Do good in thy good pleasure to Zion and build the Walls of Jerusalem Gal. 6. 16. As many as walk according to this rule, peace on them, and mercy on the Israel of God.* If you had been without baptism, you should have been without, and so without any share in these prayers.

Ans. I have put some of the Texts of Scripture down at large that you cite, and doth that Text in *Psalms 72. 13.* not relate to Jesus Christ personally considered, if not only so, yet Christ mystical, *viz.* the elect

elect Seed, and not to all the Members of the visible Church as such, and so also in the other Scriptures, and dare you thus abuse the Sacred Scriptures, applying these prayers and promises to all your Infants.

2. Do your Children as such, walk according to that Rule *Gal. 6. 16.* are they all new Creatures, read the Context, or do you not falsly apply and interpret these Scriptures.

3. And if all unbaptized Persons be without any share in those prayers, you your self are without them, for you was only Rantized. But what stress do you lay upon Baptism? Are none Members of Gods Mystical and Spiritual *Sion*, but such who are baptized.

4. Also how do you go about to blind, and deceive the Souls of your Children, in causing them to believe they are Members of Gods *Sion*, and have part in those prayers, when it may be 'tis false, or no such thing, they being (some of them when grown up,) wicked or ungodly.

3. (Say you) as you are Members of the Church of God, you have a particular right unto the promises, the inheritance of the Church are the promises, they belong unto her, and not to others, as formerly the promises belonged to the Visible Church of the *Jews*, so now to the Visible Church of the *Gentiles*, *Rom. 9.*

4. *Gal. 4. 23.*

1. *Answer.* I have proved that our Children as such, are not Members of the visible Church; no, nor ought any of the Children of Believers to be taken into it, but such that believe that repent, or that are born again.

2. If any others, viz. such that are not regenerated are taken into the visible Church, whether *Infants*, or *Adult Persons*, 'tis not by God's appointment, and therefore such have no right to the Special and Spiritual promises of God, which are the peculiar inheritance of the elect of God.

3. The visible Church of the *Jews* as so considered, had many external promises belonging to them, that is not deny'd; which the Gentile Church hath no right unto; but the whole *Jewish* Church, or all her visible Members had not a right to the Spiritual Promises of God, *They are not all Israel that are of Israel, Rom. 9. 6.*

neither because they are Seed of Abraham, are they all Children, vers. 7, that is they are the Children of the Flesh, these are not the Children of God, but the Children of the Promise are counted for the Seed, vers. 8. You mention the 4. Verse, but mention not the Verses I have cited, which open the 4th verse, and thus you go about to give a false Exposition of the Scripture, and deceive the understanding of your poor Children, and others also.

But say you, though the whole Members of the visible Church, be not partakers of the Grace of the Promises, Heb. 4. 1. which are given to the elect only, yet all the Members of the visible Church have more right to this Grace than others that are without, it being their own Fault if they refuse it.

Answer. You in the first place speak right here, but what you speak in your next Words are utterly false.

1. You say the whole Members or all the Members of the Visible Church be not partakers of the grace of the promises; this is right, but why do you say that all the Members of the Visible Church have more right to the promises than those poor Souls who are enquiring the way into the Visible Church in all sincerity of Heart. 'Tis I fear dangerous for people to set under such a Teacher. I affirm that the State of such that are let into the Visible Church, who are unsound or carnal Persons, is worse then the State of others: neither are they under the promises of grace above others: for

1. First, they conclude perhaps all is well with them and that they are converted, because the pastor of the Church, nay, and the Church her self so judgeth of them, and from hence they look not after regeneration or true Conversion, but look upon themselves to be Holy, or Saints of God; now the promises of Grace do not run to these, as they do to those, that see themselves lost and undone Sinners, being far from God, and out of the pail of the visible Church, therefore you do your Children great Mischief and hurt, in taking them into your Churches, unless they are Converted and truly gracious, 'tis no blessing nor benefit to be false Members of the visible Church? but what do you mean by the last Clause, is it the Sinners fault if he

he is not elected, or can Men obtain Grace if they will. True, they ought not to refuse God's Call.

(Say you) your baptized Children seek a clear understanding of that Obligation, and the Vow of your baptism, Learn of your Parents and Ministers to know the signification, and need of your Baptism, ye are given unto Christ, and are not your own; ye are bound to renounce the Devil and all his Works, to renounce the pomps and vanity of this wicked World, to renounce the pleasure, and lusts of the Flesh, you are bound to take God the Father to be your God and chief end, taking the Son to be your Lord and Saviour unto you, and God the Holy Ghost to be your Sanctifier, &c.

1. *Ans.* Those that are baptized should understand the Nature of that Obligation before they enter into that Covenant.

2. The end of Baptism was Ordained by Christ to shew that the Person baptized is born again, is dead to sin, not that he ought, or is bound afterwards to be Born again; no no, but after he is baptized he is obliged thereby to walk in newness of life. You by baptizing Infants invert the design and end of Baptism; how should your Children understand this Obligation, when their Parents and Ministers are so ignorant about the nature of that Obligation themselves?

3. Believers do thus take God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in baptism, to be their God, but so do not Infants by any appointment of God.

4. It appears that you approve of the Church of *Englands Catechism*, if so all your Baptized Infants are according to your Doctrine in Baptism regenerated and have thereby renounced the Devil and all his Works, &c.

3. As soon as ye come to Age and Understanding renew your Covenant with God, the Lord hath received in his Covenant the Faith of your Parents for you in your Infancy, but now ye are of Years, if ye yourselves will not believe and repent, and take God to be a God unto you, your baptism will not longer benefit you, &c.

Ans. I answer if it be thus your Children are not much beholding to their Parents Faith, nor to Covenant

nant Grace, you tell them when their Parents believed and were saved, all their Children were saved, and in covenant with them; but it appears now this only served for their Infant State, they may fall out of the Covenant of Grace, and be damned, notwithstanding their being once in the covenant of Grace, and saved with their Parents; unless they do actually believe, &c.

2. But if they had dyed in their Infancy, perhaps they would have perished, had not their Parents believed, is this your meaning; certainly if they are such that are Elected they shall be Saved, tho' they had dyed in Infancy, tho' their Parents believed or not believed, doth the Parents believing procure their Salvation, and the Parents not believing obstruct their Childrens Salvation, and so bring on them Damnation, if so the Salvation and Damnation of their Children in Infancy, is put into the hands or Faith of their Parents.

3. And if this be so, wo to the poor Babes of unbelievers, must they be all Damned? Can't Christ save such Children by his Merits and Righteousness, nor Sanctifie them that die in their Infancy, unless their Parents do believe, and baptize them; and dare you say he will not, what strange Doctrine is this; and by what authority do you assert those things which your Doctrine leads you out to do.

4. True, all our Children are Obligated by the Lord, when they come to Years of understanding, to remember their Creator, and to Fear, Love, Believe and Serve him, by the Authority and Command of his Blessed Word, but not by virtue of any Baptismal Vow he hath appointed for them in Infancy, to come under, or enter into, the State of Children in Infancy, may through Christs Merits be fast enough, if they Die then, whether their Parents believe or not, and it appears the Priviledges and Blessings of their Parents Faith doth them no good any longer, but only whilst they continue in Infancy.

4. You bid your Children that are grown up to live answerable to their Covenant.

5. Say you, give not place to Temptation, in denying your First Baptism.

Ans. Let your Children take heed that they are not blinded by your pretended baptismal privilege; so as to think they are any ways the better for that. Young Men and Women, 'tis not your Parents Faith will interest you in the Covenant of Grace, there is a twofold being in that Covenant.

1. *Decretively*. 2. *Actually* all Gods Elect ones are *Decretively* in the Covenant of Grace, but no one Soul, either Man or Woman, is *actually* in it, untill they have by Faith Union with Christ. O! labour after this Union, you are all the Children of Wrath by Nature, and your Infant Baptism alters not your State, nor had you any right to baptism when you were Infants, but if you do believe you may and ought to be Baptized by vertue of Christ's Commission or Authority of God's Word. Let not your Faith stand in this matter in the Wisdom of Men, but in the Power and Authority of the Word of God; to walk according to the Rule of the Holy Scripture herein, is not to give way to Temptation; but to the dictates of God's Spirit, let Mr. Owen say what he will.

'You bid your Children to ask such, who deny Infant baptism these following questions.

1. 'Say you, ask them, Can they prove from the Scripture that the Children of the Faithful were cast out from the Covenant of Grace. Let them shew us a plain Scripture for that: for if they are not cast out of the Covenant of Grace, then baptism, the Seal of the Covenant belongeth unto them.

1. *Ans.* Young Men and Women, pray ask Mr. Owen, whether all the Children of the Faithful (or their Children as such) were, and are in the Covenant of Grace.

2. If he says they all were, and still are in that Covenant, ask him whether then it doth not follow that they shall all be saved, because the Everlasting Covenant of Grace is well ordered in all things and sure, 2. Sam. 23. 5. and the promise of the eternal Life sure to all the true Seed of Abraham, Rom. 4. 16. confirmed by the Promise and Oath of God. Heb. 6. 13. to the 19th. verse.

3. Ask him, whether the true Spiritual Seed of Abraham, are not all Elected to Salvation, or the Elect of God.

4. Ask

4. Ask him whether there is any final falling away out of the Covenant of Grace, or possibility for one of God's Elect, eternally to perish.

5. Ask him if God did not make a Covenant with Abraham's fleshly Seed as such, that peculiarly appertained to them, in which the whole House of Israel were taken into an External, Legal, and Typical Church State, and so was a National Church, and had many External Privileges, which our Children have not.

6. Ask him whether the whole House of Israel, both Parents and Children, were all in the Covenant of Grace, and so God's People by way of Special Love and Eternal Election.

7. Ask him whether the Carnal Seed of believers as such, are to be taken into the Visible Church in the times of the Gospel, as they were under the Law. If so, ask him why *John the Baptist* did refuse them,

8. Ask him how he can prove that the fleshly Seed of believers as such, are the true Spiritual Seed of Abraham.

Tell him that Mr. *Airsworth*, a Man that he Quotes, and a Man of great Learning, and tho' a *peeo-baptist*, saith, on *Gen. 12. 7.* (thy Seed) *That is all the Children of the promise, the Elect, who only are accounted Abraham's Seed, Rom. 9. 7, 8. And in Christ, and Heirs according to the promise, Gal. 3. 29.*

And tell him that Dr. *Owen* in his Book called, *The Doctrine of the Saints perseverance. cap. 4.* saith that the effectual Dispensation of the grace of the Covenant, is peculiar to them only, who are the Children of promise, the Remnant of Abraham, according to Election, with all, that in all Nations, were to be blessed with him, and in his Seed, i. e. *Jesus Christ, Ishmael who Circumcised was cast out.* Thus Dr. *Owen*, and say I, as *Ishmael* was cast out tho' Circumcised, so *Paul* saith the bond-woman and her Son is now cast out, that is, the Old Covenant and Carnal Seed of Abraham as such, See *Gal. 4. 30.*

Tell him that *Amelius de prædest. chap. 8. Sermon 6.* A Learned Man saith, *There are many of the Seed of Abraham, to whom the word of promise did not belong then, the rejection of many Jews, who are of the Seed of Abraham doth not make void the word of promise; from whence*

whence, may we not safely conclude, That if the Natural posterity of *Abraham* were not within the Covenant of Grace by Vertue of the promise, *Gen. 17. 2.* then much less are our Natural Posterity, but the former is true, therefore the latter.

9. Ask him whether the Covenant of Grace, simply in its self gave right to Circumcision, if so why was not *Lot* and *Melchisedec* Circumcised, were they not in the Covenant of Grace?

This being so, ask him if he can prove that the Covenant of Grace, simply considered in its self gives any a right to baptism, since 'tis a meer positive Command of Christ.

10. Ask him whether ungodly Parents that spring from *Abraham's* Loyns by *Isaac* in their Generations, were not as much obliged by God's positive Command to *Abraham* to Circumcise their Male Children, as the Faithful and Godly Parents were obliged to Circumcise theirs, this being so;

11. Ask him why all ungodly persons and unbelievers ought not now to Baptize their Children, as well as believers, should baptize theirs.

2. 'You bid your Children ask such that deny Infant Baptism, can they prove from Scripture that Christ came in to the World to make the condition of Children worser then it was before.

Ans. Tell Mr. *Owen* he hath had this Question answered in this Treatise, over and over, viz. Tell him, the Spiritual Priviledges of Children now are more then theirs were under the Law: So that our Children lose no Divine and Spiritual blessings or priviledges, which the Children of the Faithful once had. God hath the same love to, and care of our Children under the Gospel, as he had to theirs under the Law; but the Temporal blessings of the Jewish Children, and their External or Earthly priviledges, then were more then our Children have in Gospel times, the Gospel Church being established upon better promises, theirs were under the promise of heaping up Gold and Silver, and possessing outward peace, and to enjoy a Land that flowed with Milk and Honey.

True the external or outward dispensation of the Gospel Covenant, which our Children are under, far exceeds

exceeds theirs for the clearness of Light and Revelation of Christ, and for other Spiritual privileges ours excels: Besides no doubt, but the Children of Believers under the Gospel far exceed the privileges of unbelievers by the blessings of a Godly Education and the like. But we say it was not the Covenant of Grace that gave right to Circumcision under the Law, but the positive Law and Command of God, so 'tis not the Covenant of Grace that gives right to baptism, but Christs positive Command, which runs not unto our Children untill they do believe; and bid Mr. Owen prove that Infant baptism doth make the condition of Children, any ways better then the condition of our Children, who never were baptized.

3. ' Were not little Children (say you) the first Martyrs that lost their Lives for the sake of Christ, *Mat.* 2. 16. If God Honoured them to be the first Witnesses for Christ, being baptized in Blood, will he deny them water Baptism.

1. *Ans.* Were they only the Children of Believers that *Herod* Murthered, how will you prove that? but suppose it was so, doth it follow from thence, that we ought to baptize them without a Command; why do you not say, and will not Christ allow our Children the Ordinance that holds forth the Shedding of his Blood, as well as Baptism, that holds forth he was Buried, &c.

4. ' If the Baptism of Infants be evil, why doth the Devil (say you) Tempt *Witches* or *Sorcerers* to deny that Baptism? And what is the reason that Satan cannot have any power over them, until they renounce their Baptism, and after that they have not any strength to resist him any longer, as several of them confessed. *Park. of Witches Vol. 3. page 640.*

1. *Ans.* Ask Mr. Owen, why the Devil doth not love, nor can't endure Popish *Holy-water*, or is such a fearful enemy to that as the Papists say it hath often been manifest? is the Consecration of Water therefore of God's appointment. Why may we not give credit to the Papists, as well as unto *Witches* and *Sorcerers*?

2. Because he cannot prove Infant Baptism from Arguments from *Heaven* will he go for Arguments

to prove it to be Christs Ordinance taken from *Hell*?

3. The Devil is a crafty and subtle Adversary, doth not he do this to make People love and approve of their Infant Baptism, which no doubt Christ never appointed.

4. However this Testimony is given only by *Witches* and *Sorcerers*, and what ground have we to believe them?

5. 'Ask them will they give you assurance that you will be better Christians, by receiving of their baptism, if they say you will be the better, answer them, that you see several of them growing worse after their re-baptization.

1. *Answ.* Ask Mr. *Owen*, whether there are not more People that were Baptized, or rather Rantized in Infancy, that prove vile and ungodly, then among them that were baptized upon the profession of their Faith.

2. What assurance can he give to Infants, or to their Parents that the Children they baptize shall be better Christians thereby? Also how will he prove that the Children of believers who were baptized in Infancy, prove generally better Christians then the Children of those Believers that did not baptise them in their Infancy.

3. Ask him if the baptism of believers upon the profession of their Faith (as Christ commanded) be the worse because some, like *Simon Magus*, take it up, and prove ill Members and scandalous in their Lives.

1. 'Say you, tho' they are Members of a Congregation, walking by the Rule of the Gospel, before they had their re-baptization, they after break the Unity of the Body they were Members of, by separating themselves, Baptism is an Ordinance of Unity, but re-baptization is the breaking off the Unity of Churches.

1. *Answ.* Why do you use such *Tautologies* and needless repetitions, you had this before, and I have answered it, we deny our baptism to be re-baptization, and have proved your Rantism is no Baptism at all.

2. Infant Rantism, 'tis true, Unites National Churches, and Churches Built upon that, or the like Constitution, and so it Unites many false and Anti-christian Churches I must confess, as the Church of *Rome*, and some

some others in the World, much of the same nature; but 'tis the baptism of Christ, viz. that of believers that Unites together, according to the order of the Gospel, all the Members of a true Gospel Church; and the denying of Infant baptism, and being baptized upon a profession of Faith, does but break the Union of Churches of the Saints, that are formerly true and orderly gathered, according to the Institution of Christ, and the rule of the Gospel: For was not the first Gospel Church at *Jerusalem*, gathered out of the National Church of the *Jews*, of Persons that repented, believed, and upon the profession of that Faith Baptized, that is Dipped in Water, in the Name of the *Father, Son and Holy Ghost*; also the Church in *Samaria*, *Acts 8.* and that in *Acts 10.* and that at *Corinth*, *Acts 16.* and that at *Ephesus*, *Acts 19.* and ought not all Churches so to be gathered to the end of the World? ought we not to separate from such Churches, that do not hold the Ordinances that appertain to Church Constitution, as they were first delivered to the Saints, and from such who are guilty also of an Human Innovation, ought we to partake of other Mens Sins, or ought we not to keep ourselves pure, *Touch not, Taste not, Handle not, which all are to perish with the using after the Commandments and Doctrines of Men*, *Col. 2. 21, 22.*

2. 'You say, before they had their re-baptization they we more Charitable in their Judgment, but afterwards they are usually of a strict and narrow Judgment, Judging hard and uncharitably of them that are not of their persuasion; therefore this Opinion that queneth Love, is not of God, *1 Cor. 13.* I do not say of them all, that their Love to the Brethren waxeth colder, when they are baptized, but of the greatest part of them, the virtue of the Grace of God, overcometh the vertue of this Opinion, and keepeth them from falling into the same Temptation of uncharitableness with others.

1. *Ans.* Non: of us were ever re-baptized, pray cease your hard and uncharitable Pen and Tongue.

2. Our Chariiy is greater far then that Mans, whose Opinion about Infant Baptism, leads him to cast all out of the Holy Catholick Church, who disown Infant Baptism, and are baptized as Believers.

3. We have so much Charity to all godly Christians that are *pedo-baptists*, that we own them to be our Brethren and Members of the Mystical Body of Christ, and have the like Love to them as to those who are of our own persuasion in the point of Baptism, even to all where we see the Image of God.

4. If any among us are too uncharitable, yet assure your self it is not this Ordinance of Christ, which they own that naturally leads them forth so to be, but 'tis from the corruption of their own hearts, therefore you do very ill to Father it on their Opinion.

5. But as to Communion at the Lord's Table, we believe we are limited and bounded therein by the rule of God's Word, and 'tis not for want of Charity to your Churches we cannot have Church Communion with you (tho' all other Communion of Saints we can have with you) but 'tis because we would walk orderly as God directeth us in the Gospel, and I should be sorry to hear any of my Brethren to be of another mind; I am for Catholick Communion, and Charity with all Saints, tho' not for Church Communion with any that are unbaptized, as I believe you all are that have only had Infants Rantism.

3. 'There are others since their re-baptization, (say you) go further, and have fallen from one delusion into another, some set up free will, others denying the Christian Sabbath, others against Catechizing of Children, &c.

1. *Answ.* 'Tis very uncharitable in you to reflect upon the whole party of Baptized Believers from the errors of some that are of our Opinion in respect of Baptism.

2. You may see a Confession of our Faith, and a late Narrative of the result of a General Assembly of Pastors, Ministers and Messengers of 107 Churches, in which we Testifie against *free-will*, and do abhor that Notion, and own the Christian Sabbath, *viz.* the first day of the Week, and vindicate the Catechizing of Children, have also published a *Catechism* to that end, and do bewail the neglect of that great Duty where ever it is found to be neglected, either among us, or others.

2. But

2. But are there no *free-willers* nor *Baxterians* among you, whose principles are much the same, if not something worse, why then do you thus reflect on us?

‘Require plain Answers (say you) from them unto these Questions, and cause them to prove all from the Holy Scriptures, the God of all Grace settle yon in the present Truth, that ye might bring forth Fruits meet to your Baptism. Thus you end your Book.

Ans. You have had plain Answers unto all your Questions, and many other Questions for you to Answer, and we have proved all we say from the Scriptures, from whence you will never prove your Practice of Infant Baptism whilst the World standeth. And now the good Lord open your eyes; and the eyes of your Sons and Daughters, to see their Error, and shew you the Ancient Footsteps of the Flock, that you and they may feed besides the Shepherds Tents, and increase Love and Charity among us all, which is too much wanting. O where is the power of godliness. Many can spy the Mote in their Brothers Eye.

CHAP. XXIV.

Containing some brief practical use of the whole precedent Treatise, with seasonable Counsel to Parents, &c.

NOW *Reader*, from what thou hast heard or read, in this Treatise, and answer to Mr. *James Owen*,

1. I may infer that all those who have only been Sprinkled or Rantized, who are afterwards Baptized when they Believed, are not re-baptized, as Mr. *Owen* doth affirm, nor do they renounce their Baptism, tho' they do renounce the practice and Human Tradition of Sprinkling of Infants or Adult Persons.

2. We may also infer that 'tis a hard thing to restore a lost Ordinance, or to reform about a long standing Custom and Tradition of Men.

1. Do all you *Pious Parents* bless God for Christ and the Gospel, and for all those priviledges he hath bestowed upon you, and upon your Children, who when they are grown up, set under the precious and clear Preaching of Christ Crucified. Be sure, improve these blessings, and take heed that you walk in all things according to the rule of God's Word, and do not follow a *Multitude* to do evil, (tho' some of them are good Men.)

O tremble to do any thing in God's Worship without lawful authority from him, I mean precept or example from his Word, do not adventure to Baptize, much less to *Rantize* your Children any more, whatever Mr. Owen (or any Man on Earth saith) unless you can find it written in your Bibles. God hath not commanded you to bring them into a baptismal Covenant in their Infancy, nor made any promise of blessing to assist them in performing that Covenant, if you do bring them into it of your own Head voluntarily.

If you do, and will do this thing, notwithstanding you have no authority from God's Word to do it; Pray consider what I have said in this Treatise about this devised and unwarrantable Covenant, by which you may heap up much guilt upon your selves, and lay such a Load and Burden upon your Children, that you are not aware of: Mr. Williams's frightnes them with the Sin of Perjury, who violate this Covenant, may not this tend to drive them into despair, and God will never charge them with Perjury, since he never commanded them to enter into any such Covenant: Your Children who when grown up if wicked and ungodly have too much guilt, both Original sin, and Actual sin, lying upon them, there is little need to add to their Burden; for their want of Light, and by Reading of such Mens Books, they may perhaps thus charge themselves. Mr. Dan. Williams says, 'tis the damning sin: no no, the Damning sin is the breach of God's Law, and particularly the sin of unbelief.

Nay, and doth not his words Imply that when your Children are grown up, and they by Light received from

from God's word, should be convinced they were never baptized at all, and so cast off and renounce their Infants *Baptism*, that they hereby become guilty of Perjury, and must be Damned, for he speaks not of those sins forbidden in God's Word, but the violation of this baptismal Covenant, which he saith is Perjury, and *the Damning Sin*, and *Root of all Sin*. O! what want of Charity is here in these Men, and what New and strange Doctrine do they Teach!

2. Train up your Children in the fear of God, and set them a good example, and pray for them, and over them and give them good Instruction, godly Counsel and Admonition: And see that you neglect not to Catechise them daily, that so they may understand early, the main Grounds and Principles of Religion; but dread to Baptize them in Infancy, or before they believe and have the inward and Spiritual Grace signified in true Baptism.

You have had it proved from God's Word, that there is no Ground nor Authority from thence to baptize Infants, and know 'tis not in the power of Man by external Rite, to bring Children into the Covenant of Grace, nor to make them Members of his Visible Church: neither Baptism nor the Lords Supper are Bread for Infants; but for Christ's New Born Babes, 1 *Per.* 2. 1, 2, 3, 5. not for your Children as such, but such only that are the true Children of God, who are born of the Spirit.

3. Do not go about directly nor indirectly to deceive your Children, by making them believe they are in a good condition, by reason they are the Seed of believing Parents, and Baptized as these Men call Sprinkling, and so that way made Christians, and so from hence perhaps look for no further or other work of Grace, or regeneration; but think they by this pretended baptism are the Children of God, Members of Christ, and Inheritors of the Kingdom of Heaven; when 'tis in Truth no such thing, nor have you any cause to doubt but that your Infants, who die tho' not baptized are happy, as appears from what we have said, neither be you so ignorant to believe that baptism can save your Infants, or the Adult either; nor let poor Children cry out against their ungodly Pa-

rents, as some of these pedo-baptists intimate they may do. Pray see what Mr. *Burkitt* saith in his Book, page 62. *Before your Children are born, make sure as much as in you lieth, that they may be born within the Covenant, and under the promise, by your being in Covenant with God Your selves; see that the Lord be your God in Covenant with you, and then you may comfortably hope he will be the God of your Seed.*

Ans. This Doctrine implys, that 'tis in the power of Men and Women to bring their Children into the Covenant of Grace, and as also it denotes that the Children of believers are not Born Children of Wrath by Nature, for are those that are born in the Covenant of Grace, born Children of Wrath? O ye *Parents*, know that you may be in Covenant, and your Children never in it whilst they live, nay die out of Covenant, as doubtless many Children of the Faithful do. Nor hath God made any such Covenant with any believer, and their Natural Seed as such, as he made with *Abraham*, who was the Father of all that believe, but so are not you nor I, tho' we are believers and in Covenant with God, and walk in *Abrahams* Steps. Those that are in the Election of Grace of your Seed, never fear, but God will in due time bring into the Covenant of Grace, and give all the Covenant Blessings and Priviledges, but if any of them are not comprehended in the Election of Grace, their being born of your Loyns, will not, cannot bring them into the Covenant of Grace, nor give them a right to the Seal thereof, viz. the holy Spirit; nor can baptism bring any into it, which is only an outward Sign of our being in that Covenant, or of that divine and spiritual Grace we received, before we were baptized as I have proved.

Your business and your Childrens also, is to make your own Election sure, by special and effectual calling.

'Tis not the first birth, but the second that brings either you or your Children into the Covenant of Grace, so that we and they may have God to be our God by way of special Interest.

But mark Mr. *Burkitts* next words, page 62. *O! were but Infants capable of knowledge, how much would they dread being born of wicked Parents? make it your endeavour before*

before your Children are born to sanctifie your poor Children, this is done by prayer, &c.

1. *Ans^w.* This is enough to set the Children against their ungodly Parents, nay to hate them in their Hearts: *Alas!* the Children of wicked Parents. I see not, but they may be in as good a Condition as many Children of believers (tho' I doubt not but God doth let out his infinite Grace generally more to the seed of the Faithful when grown up then to others) but God will not certainly destroy poor Children for the fault and unbelief of their Parents. Therefore as your begetting them in the first birth, tho' gracious cannot save them, so your begetting them, tho' wicked cannot damn or destroy them.

There is no reason saith Mr. Perkins, that the wickedness of the Parents should prejudice the Children in things pertaining to eternal Life. Perkins on Gal. 3. p. 264.

2. However if it be as Mr. *Burkitt* and Mr. *Owen* say, that when believers are in Covenant their Children are in Covenant also; Doubtless they are in a safe condition, whether baptized or not, that doth not bring them into Covenant.

3. But may not this Doctrine of theirs, put a just rebuke upon unbelievers or ungodly persons, for once attempting to Marry and beget Childre that are in such a sad condition, by reason their Parents were not in Covenant with God, ought they, nay may they lawfully Marry, this being consider'd, and such dreadful effects following, upon their poor Babes; besides, how far doth this Covenant blessing and priviledge extend? If my *Grand Father*, was in Covenant, tho' my Father and I too, are wicked and ungodly Persons, are not we still in Covenant with God. The Covenant of *Peculiarity* God made with *Abraham*, viz. that of Circumcision, extended not only to his immediate Seed or Off-Spring; but to all his Natural Seed successively in their Generations, untill Christ came and put an end to that external Covenant, and Covenant Right.

CHAP. XXV.

Containing several Queries for Mr. Owen to answer, since the Athenian Society have not done it, who some time since did attempt it.

Sir,

I Having wrote a few *Queries* lately about Infant Baptism, for the *Athenian Society*, to answer upon their bold Challenge; and since they are too hard for them to do it, having said nothing at all to the purpose; I shall expect to see them answered by you, when you answer this reply to your Book, I shall not trouble you with all, but only with a few of them.

Query, 1. Whether the being the Children of *Abraham*, as such, gave them a right to Circumcision, or rather the meer positive Command of God to *Abraham*?

To this they gave no Answer.

Query 2. Whether Circumcision could be said to be a Seal of any Mans Faith, save *Abraham's* only, seeing 'tis only called the Seal of the Righteousness of his Faith, and also of the Faith which he had, being yet uncircumcised?

To this the *Athenian Society* answer, amongst the Ancient Hereticks, they never met with such a strange position as this, *viz.* that the Seal of the Righteousness of Faith was the priviledge of *Abraham* only. *Is this an answer?* Besides they mistake, it is not a Position, but a Question. Furthermore 'tis said that *Abraham* received the sign of Circumcision, not only as a Seal of the Righteousness of that Faith he had, being yet uncircumcised, but also (*Mark*) that he might be the Father of all that believe. Was this the priviledge of any save *Abraham* only?

Query 3. What do you conceive Circumcision did, or Baptism doth seal, or doth make sure to Infants, since

a Seal usually makes firm all the blessings and priviledges contained in that Covenant 'tis affixed to?

The *Athenians* answer. *It Seals and did seal to all that did belong to Christ, Life and Salvation, but to such as do not, it Seals nothing at all.*

To which I reply. How dare any Man Seal the Covenant of Salvation to such, who have not that Faith *Abraham* had, before he received that Seal? It was not a Seal of that Faith he might have, or might not have afterwards, but of that Faith he had before he received it. Secondly I affirm Baptism is no Seal at all of Salvation, for if it was, and of God's appointment, all that are Sealed would be saved; even *Simon Magus*, but many who are Baptized, may perish eternally, and do no doubt.

Query 4. I demand to know what those external priviledges are, Infants partake of in Baptism, seeing they are denyed the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and all other external Rites whatsoever? If you say when they believe, they shall partake of those priviledges and blessings; so say I shall the Children of unbelievers, *Turks* and *Pagans* as well as they.

The *Athenian Society* answer. *We insist not upon external priviledges; 'tis forrein to the Matter.*

1. *Ans.* If you insist not on internal priviledges nor on external priviledges, that are Sealed to Infants that are Baptized, what does their Baptism signifie? Just nothing; but which is worse; 'tis a prophanation of Christ's Holy significant Ordinance of Baptism, and this indeed is worst of all.

Query 5. If the fleshly Seed, or Children of believing *Gentiles*, as such, are to be counted the Seed of *Abraham*; I *Query* whither they are his Spiritual Seed, or his Natural Seed? if not his Spiritual Seed, nor his Natural Seed, what right can they have to Baptism or Church Membership, from any Covenant Transaction God made with *Abraham*?

The *Athenians* answer. *They are his Spiritual Seed Visible, for so far only belongs to us to Judge; and therefore they have a right to the Seal of that Covenant.*

Reply, What they say cannot be true, because the Scripture positively saith, that such who are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, have the Faith of *Abraham*, and walk in the Steps of *Abraham*, and are Christ's, *Gal. 3. ult.* But Infants of Believers, as such, cannot be said to have the Faith of *Abraham*, nor to walk in *Abraham's* Steps, &c.

2. Such who are *Abraham's* Spiritual Seed, are in the Election of Grace, and are always his Seed, not for so long, but for ever, we can judge none to be *Abraham's* Spiritual Seed, but such only in whom these Signs appear before mentioned ; but none of those Signs appear, nor can appear in Infants ; therefore we cannot judge they are his Spiritual Seed, to whom the Seal of the Covenant of Grace of right does belong.

Query 6. Whither the Children of Believers are in the Covenant of Grace absolutely, or but conditionally, if only conditionally, what further priviledge have they above the Children of unbelievers.

• *Query 7.* Whither those different Grounds upon which the right of Infant Baptism, is pretended by the Ancient Fathers of Old, and the Modern Divines, doth well agree, with an Institution, that is a meer positive right, wholly depending on the Sovereign will of the Legislator, and whether this doth not give just cause to all to question its authority ?

1. Some Pedo-baptists asserted, it took away Original Sin ; and such who denyed it were *Anathematized*.

2. Some affirm that Children are in Covenant, and being the Seed of Believers are Fæderally Holy, therefore to be Baptized.

3. Another sort of Pedo-baptists, say they ought to be baptized by vertue of their Parents Faith.

4. Another sort Baptize them upon the Faith of their Sureties.

5. Others say by the Faith of the Church, as *Austin*, *Bernard*, &c.

6. Others say they have Faith themselves, *i. e.* Habitual Faith ; and therefore must be baptized.

7. Some say it is only an Apostolical unwritten Tradition, But others deny that, and say it may be proved from the Scripture.

8. Others

8. Others say 'tis a Regenerating Ordinance, and Infants are thereby put into a fable State: Others say, the Infants of Believers are born therefore safe before in Covenant with their Parents.

To this *Query* they say nothing, pretending they had answer'd it before.

Query 8. Whither that can be an Ordinance of Christ, for which there is neither precept nor example, nor plain and undeniable Consequences for it in all God's Word, nor promise made to such who do it, nor threats pronounced on such as neglect it?

Their answer is there, *About Womens Receiving the Sacrament, &c.*

Query 9. Whether in matter of meer positive Right, such as Baptism is, we ought not to keep expressly and punctually to the Revelation of the Will of the Law-giver?

They answer, yes.

Reply. Then your Cause is lost, for God's Word expressly directs us to Baptize only such who are first Taught, or made Disciples by Teaching, or who make a profession of their Faith; and Dipping is the express Act of Baptizing, as practised in the *New Testament*, which a great Cloud of Witnesses testifie.

Query 10. Whether the Baptism of Infants be not a dangerous Error, since it tends to deceive poor Ignorant People, who think they are thereby made Christians and Regenerated, and so never look after any other Regeneration or Baptism, that represents or or holds forth the inward work of God's Grace?

They answer, *They never tell them they are made Christians thoroughly, &c.*

Then I Appeal to all Men, who have Read the Old Church Catechism. — *In my Baptism, wherein I was made a Child of God, a Member of Christ and an Inheritor of the Kingdom of God.*

11. Since we read but of one Baptism in Water, and that one Baptism is that of the Adult, *i. e.* such who profess Faith, &c. How can Infant Baptism or rather Rantism be an Ordinance of Christ.

12. Whe-

12. Whether there is any Covenant appointed by Christ for Infants to enter into, unto which no promise is made of assistance to perform it, nor Blessing promised if it be kept, nor one threatning if cast off and disowned?

13. What should be the reason that our Translators of the Holy Bible should leave the Greek word *Baptism*, or *Baptisma*, untranslated: seeing the Dutch have not done so; but contrarywise Translate for *John Baptist* *John the Dipper*, and for he *Baptized* them, he *Dipped* them.

The Athenian Society answer, *They are the best Judges themselves, and if we can understand them 'tis enough.*

Reply. No, tho' the Learned in the Greek do know what the word *Baptizo* and *Baptisma* is, yet the unlearned in that Tongue do not know that it is to *Dip* or *Immersion*, therefore 'tis not enough.

14. Whither such who have been Sprinkled, ought not to be deemed unbaptized Persons, since *aspergo* is not *Immersion*, or *Rantizing* not Baptizing, seeing the Greek word signifies to *Dip*; and tho' sometimes to *Wash*; yet such a Washing as is by Dipping, as the Learned confess.

To this they say, *Those that doubt may be of the surer side.*

15. Whither the Ancient Church, who gave the Lords Supper to Infants as well as baptism might not be allowed to do the one as the other; since Faith and Holy Habits, yea to believe with all the Heart, is required of them that are to be Baptized, as Faith, Examination, and to discern the Lord's Body, is required of them that partake of the Lord's Supper, and since also all that were baptized into the Apostolick Church, were immediately admitted to the Lord's Supper; and also seeing the arguments taken from the Covenant, and because Children are said to be Holy, and belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, are as strong for their being admitted to both the Sacraments as one, and there being no

Com-

Command nor example for either, and Human Tradition carrying it equally for both for several Centuries.

16. Whither *Nadab*, *Abihu* and *Uzzah's* Transgressions were not as much Circumstantial; and so as small Errors, as it is to alter Dipping into Sprinkling, and from an understanding believer, to an Infant that understands not its Right Hand from its Left; and whether to allow the Church a power to make such alterations be not dangerous, it being an adding and diminishing from God's Word, see *Rev. 22. 18.* and doth not this open likewise a Door to any other like innovation?

17. Whither there is any just cause for Men to vilifie and reproach the *Baptists* with the Name of *Anabaptists*, for their Baptizing Believers, seeing asperision is not baptizing, and in regard also, that they have the direct and positive Word and Command of Christ so to do, and not only the Commission, *Mat. 28. Mark 16.* but also the constant use of the Apostles, and Ministers of the Gospel, all along in the New Testament, who baptized none but such who made a profession of their Faith in the Gospel time; observable 'tis also, that the *Church of England also saith, that Faith and Repentance are required of such who are to be baptized.*

18. Whither if our Translators had Translated the Greek Word *Baptizo*, from *bapto*, they must not have Translated it, *Dipping* or to *Dip* from the Native and Genuine signification of the word, and whether they have done well to leave those words in the Original Tongue, without giving the plain meaning in the *English*?

19. Seeing the *Greek Church* uses Immersion to this Day, and not asperision or Sprinkling, may not it be a great argument against Sprinkling, seeing also that they disown the Baptism of the *Latin Church*, because they do not *Dip*: For doubtless the *Greeks* best know the genuine, literal and proper signification of that Word, that Tongue being their own Natural Language, in which the New Testament was Originally written.

20. What reason can be given why *Nazianzen* an Eminent *Greek Father* should Counsel the deferring the Baptism

Baptism of Infants untill the third or fourth year of their Age (except in danger of Death) if it were in *Nazianzen's* time, as some suppose it was, the Opinion of the whole Church, as also his own, that Infants by an Apostolical Tradition, were to be baptized as such, that is as soon as born.

21. Whither all the Fathers of the Third and Fourth Century, both of the *Greek* and *Latin* Church, who have wrote any thing about Infant Baptism, do not unanimously give this as the reason why Infants should be baptized, *viz.* for to wash away Original Sin, or the putting them into a capacity of Salvation ; and some of them, particularly St. *Austin* sentencing Infants to Damnation if not Baptized.

22. If so, whether the Fathers might not be mistaken in the Right of Infant Baptism, as well as in the Judgment of most Protestants they were touching the reason why they should be baptized.

23. Whither God hath allowed or enjoined Parents to bring their little Babes of Two or Ten days Old into a Covenant with him by Baptism, since 'tis not to be found in the Holy Scripture, that he either hath allowed or enjoined them so to do, there being neither Command nor Example nor the least intimation given for them to do it?

24. If it cannot be proved he hath required any such thing at their Hands, whether that Covenant can be said to bind their Conscience when they come to Age, especially since they gave no consent to do it, nor were capable so to do?

25. And if this pretended Covenant was not of God's appointment, I Query how those Children who refuse to agree to the said Covenant, when they come to Age, can be guilty (as Mr. *Daniel Williams* says) 1. of rejecting Christ. 2. Of renouncing the blessings of the Gospel. 3. And that 'tis Rebellion continued against their Parents. 4. That it is Ingratitude and Perjury to their Redeemer. 5. Gross injustice to their Parents. 6. That it is self-killing Cruelty to their own Souls. 7. The damning Sin. I Query whether this is good Divinity or not, or rather is it not a strange Doctrine, and whether those unwarrantable Articles of Faith taken out of the *Jewish Talmud* or *Turkish Alcoran*, may not be of as good Authority

Authority or whether it be fit to put such positions into a Christian Catechism, as these are.

Pray be pleased to Answer these plain Queries when you write again, or Reply to this answer of your Book.

C H A P. XXVI.

Containing Divers Arguments to disprove Pedo-Baptism, and to prove the Baptism of Believers, which Mr. Owen is desir'd to Answer when he writes again.

Arg. 1. **I**F none are to be Baptized by the Authority of the Great Commission of our blessed Saviour, *Mat. 28.* but such who are first Taught or made Disciples by Teaching, then Infants who are not capable to be taught, ought not to be baptized. But none are to be baptized by the Authority of the great Commission of our Blessed Saviour, but such who are first Taught or made Disciples by Teaching. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be Baptized.

Arg. 2. If Infant Baptism was never Instituted, Commanded, or Appointed of God, Infants ought not to be Baptized. But Infant baptism was never Instituted, Commanded or Appointed of God; *Ergo* they ought not to be baptized.

As to the *Major*; if one thing may be practised as an Ordinance without an Institution, or Command of God, another thing may also; and so any Innovation may be let into the Church.

As to the *Minor*; If there is an Institution for it, &c. 'Tis either contained in the great Commission, *Mat. 28.* *Mark 16.* or somewhere else. But 'tis not contained in the great Commission, nor any where else, *Ergo*, &c.

The *Major* none will deny.

The *Minor* I prove thus. None are to be baptized by virtue of the Commission, but such who are Discipled by the Word, as I said before, and so the Greek word *μαθητῆς* signifies.

If any should say Christ Commanded his Disciples to Baptize all Nations, and Infants are part of Nations, therefore ought to be baptized, I answer,

Arg. 3. If all Nations or any in the Nations ought to be Baptized before Discipled; then *Turks, Pagans*, unbelievers and their Children may be Baptized, because they are a great part of the Nations, but *Turks, Pagans* and unbelievers, and their Children ought not to be baptized, *Ergo*, &c.

Besides, That Teaching (by the Authority of the Commission) must go before baptizing, we have proved; which generally all Learned Men do assert: If the Institution is to be found any where else, they must shew the place.

Arg. 4. Faith and Repentance are required of all that ought to be baptized; but Infants are not required to Believe and Repent, nor are they capable so to do, *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

The *Major* is clear, *Acts* 2. 8. 10. 16. *Chapters*, and its also asserted by the Church of *England*. What is required of Persons to be baptized? that's the *Question*. the *Answer* is, Repentance, whereby they forsake Sin; and Faith, whereby they stedfastly believe the promise of God made to them in that Sacrament.

The *Minor* cannot be denied.

Arg. 5. That practice that tends not to the Glory of God, nor the profit of the Child, when done, nor in aftertimes when grown up, but may prove hurtful, and of a dangerous Nature to him, cannot be a Truth of God. but the practice of Infant Baptism tends not to the Glory of God, nor the profit of the Child, when Baptized, nor in aftertimes when grown up, but may be hurtful and of a dangerous Nature to him, *Ergo*, See *Levit.* 10. 1, 2. Where *Moses* told *Aaron*, *Because his Sons* had done that which God the Lord Commanded them not, *That God would be Sanctified by all that drew near unto him*; intimating that such who did that which God Commanded them not, did not Sanctifie or Glorifie,

sic God therein. Can God be glorified by Man's Disobedience, or by adding to his Word ; by doing that which God hath not required ? *Mat. 18. 9. In vain do you Worship me, Teaching for Doctrine the Commandments of Men.* And that that practice doth profit the Child, none can prove from God's Word. And in after times when grown up, it may cause the Person to think he was thereby made a Christian, &c. and brought into the Covenant of Grace, and had it sealed to him, nay thereby regenerated, for so the *Athenian Society* in their *Mercury, December 26.* plainly intimate, and that Infants are thereby ingrafted also into Christs Church. Sure all understanding Men know the Baptism of Believers is not called Regeneration, but only Metonymically , it being a Figure of Regeneration. But they Ignorantly affirm also, that Infants then have a Federal Holiness, as if this imagined Holiness comes in by the Parents Faith, or by the Childs Covenant in Baptism, which may prove hurtful & dangerous to them, and cause them to think Baptism confers Grace, which is a great error. How can water (saith *Mr. Charnock*) an external thing, work upon the Soul Physically? nor can it (saith he) be proved that ever the Spirit of God is tied by any promise to apply himself to the Soul in a gracious operation, when Water is applyed to the Body. If it were so, then all that were baptized should be saved, or else the Doctrine of Perseverance falls to the Ground. Some indeed (says he) say, that Regeneration is conferred in Baptism upon the Elect, and exerts its self afterwards in Conversion. But how so active a Principle as Spiritual Life; should lye dead and a sleep so many years, &c. is not easily conceived. *On Regen. page 75.*

Arg. 6. If the Church of *England* says, that Faith and Repentance are required of all that ought to be baptized, and in so saying, speaks truly, and yet Infants can't perform those things; then Infants ought not to be Baptized. But the Church of *England* says that Faith and Repentance are required of all such, &c. and speak truly, and yet Infants cannot perform these things, *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

Obj. If it be objected, *That they affirm they do perform by their Sureties.*

Ans. If Suretiship for Children in Baptism is not required of God, and the Sureties do not, yea cannot perform those things for the Child, then Suretyship is not of God, and so signifies nothing, but is an unlawful, and sinful undertaking; but Suretiship in Childrens Baptism is not required of God, and they do not, cannot perform what they promise, *Ergo, &c.*

Do they, or can they cause the Child to forsake the Devil and all his works, the Pomps and Vanities of this wicked World, and all the sinful Lusts of the Flesh? In a word, can they make the Child, or Children, to repent and truly believe in Jesus Christ? for these are the things they promise for them and in their Name. Alas! they want power to do it for themselves, and how then should they do it for others? Besides, we see they never mind nor regard their Covenant in the case; and will not God one day say, who has required these things at your hands?

Arg. 7. If there be no president in the Scripture, (as there is no precept) that any Infant was baptized, then Infants ought not to be baptized; But there is no president that any Infant was baptized in the Scripture, *Ergo.*

If there is any precedent or example in Scripture, that any Infant was baptized, let them shew us where we may find it.

Erasmus saith, 'Tis no where expressed in the Apostolical writings, that they baptized Children. *Union of the Church*, and on *Rom. 6.*

Calvin saith, 'tis no where expressed by the Evangelists; that any one Infant was baptized by the Apostles. *Instit. cap. 16. lib. 4.*

Ludovicus Vives saith, None of Old were wont to be baptized but in grown Age, and who desired and understood what it was. *Vide Lud.*

The *Magdeburgenses* say, That concerning the baptizing the Adult, both *Jews* and *Gentiles*, we have sufficient proof, *Acts 2. 8, 10. 16. Chap.* but as to the baptizing of Infants, they can meet with no example in Scripture. *Magdeb. Cant. l. 2. page. 469.*

Dr. Taylor saith, It is against the perpetual Analogie of Christs Doctrine to baptize Infants: For besides that Christ never gave any precept to baptize them

‘ them, nor ever himself nor his Apostles (that appears)
 ‘ did baptize any of them; so all that either he or his
 ‘ Apostles said concerning it, requires such previous
 ‘ dispositions of baptism; of which Infants are not capa-
 ‘ ble, *viz.* Faith and Repentance. *Lib. proph. page 239.*

Arg. 8. If whatsoever is necessary to Faith and
 practice is left in the Holy Scripture, that being a
 compleat and perfect Rule, and yet Infant Baptism is
 not contained, or to be found therein, then Infant Bap-
 tism is not of God; but whatever is necessary to Faith
 and Practice is contained in the Holy Scriptures, &c.
 but Infant baptism is not to be found therein, *Ergo.*

That the Scripture is a perfect Rule, &c. we have the
 consent of all the Ancient Fathers, and Modern Di-
 vines.

‘ *Athanasius* saith, The Holy Scriptures being Inspi-
 ‘ rations of God, are sufficient to all Instructions of
 ‘ Truth. *Athanasius against the Gentiles.*

‘ *Crisostom* saith, All things be plain and clear in the
 ‘ Scripture; and whatsoever are needful, are manifest
 ‘ there. *Crisostom on 2 Thess. and 2 Tim. 2.*

‘ *Basil* saith, That it would be an Argument of Infi-
 ‘ delity, and a most certain Sign of Pride, if any Man
 ‘ should reject any thing written, and should introduce
 ‘ things not written. *Basil in his Sermon de fide.*

‘ *Augustin* saith; In the Scriptures are found all things
 ‘ which contain Faith, manner of Living, Hope, Love, &c.
 ‘ Let us, (saith he) seek no farther then what is written
 ‘ of God our Saviour, lest a Man would know more
 ‘ that the Scriptures witness. *Augustin in his 198 Epistles*
 ‘ *to Fortunatus.*

‘ *Theophilast* saith, It is part of a Diabolical Spirit to
 ‘ think any thing Divine without the Authority of the
 ‘ Holy Scripture. *Lib. 2. pasch.*

‘ *Ishchius* saith, Let us who will have any thing ob-
 ‘ served of God, search no more but that which the Go-
 ‘ spel doth give unto us. *Lib. 5. cap. 16. on Levit.*

‘ *Bellarmin* saith; That though the Arguments of the
 ‘ Anabaptists, from the defect of Command or Exam-
 ‘ ple, have a great use against the *Lutherans*, for as
 ‘ much as they use that Rite every where, and having
 ‘ no Command or Example; theirs is to be rejected; yet is
 ‘ it of no force against *Catholicks*, who conclude that

‘an Apostolical Tradition is of no less authority with us
 ‘than the Scripture, &c. This of baptizing of Infants
 ‘is an Apostolical Tradition. *Bell. Lib. de Bapt. 1.
 ‘cap. 8.*

‘Mr. *Ball* saith, We must for every Ordinance look
 ‘for the Institution, and never stretch it wider, nor
 ‘draw it narrower than the Lord hath made it, for he is
 ‘the Institutor of the Sacraments, according to his
 ‘own pleasure; and ’tis our part to Learn of him, both
 ‘to whom, how, and for what end the Sacraments are
 ‘to be administered. *Ball in his answer of the New-Eng-
 ‘land Elders page 38, 39.*

And as to the *Minor* ’tis acknowledged by our Adver-
 saries, it is not to be found in the Letter of the Scrip-
 ture. And as to the Consequences drawn therefrom, (we
 have proved,) they are not Natural from the premises;
 and tho’ we will admit of Consequences and Inferences
 if Genuine, yet not in the case of an Institution respec-
 ting a practical Ordinance that is of meer positive
 Right.

Arg. 9. If Infant Baptism was an Institution of
 Christ, the Pedo-baptists could not be at a loss about
 the Grounds of the Right Infants have to Baptism:
 but the Pedo-baptists are at a great loss, and differ ex-
 ceedingly about the Grounds of the Right Infants have
 to Baptism, *Ergo* ’tis no Institution of Christ.

As touching the *Major*, I argue thus; that which is
 an Institution of Christ, the Holy Scripture doth shew,
 as well the end, and ground of the Ordinance, as the
 subject and manner of it; but the Scripture speaks no-
 thing of the end and ground of Pedo-baptism, or for
 what reason they ought to be baptized, *Ergo*, It is no
 Institution of Christ.

The *Minor* is undeniable; some affirm as we have
 already shew’d, that it was to take away Original Sin;
 others say it is, theirs right by the Covenant, they
 being the Seed of Believers; others say, Infants have
 Faith, and therefore have a Right; others say, they
 have a Right by the Faith of their Surety. Some
 ground their Right from Apostolical Tradition; others
 upon the authority of Scripture: Some say, all Chil-
 dren of professed Christians ought to be baptized,
 others say none but the Children of true believers have

a Right to it, sure if it was an Ordinance of Christ, his word would soon end this Controverſie.

Arg. 10. If the Children of believing *Gentiles*, as ſuch, are not the Natural nor Spiritual Seed of *Abraham* they can have no Right to Baptiſm, or Church Membership, by virtue of any Covenant Tranſaction God made with *Abraham*; but the Children of Believing Parents, as ſuch, are not the Natural, nor Spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, Ergo.

Arg. 11. If no Man can prove from Scripture that any Spiritual benefit redounds to Infants in their Baptiſm, 'tis no Ordinance of Chriſt; But no Man can prove from Scripture, that any ſpiritual benefit redounds to Infants in their Baptiſm, Ergo.

Arg. 12. That cannot be an Ordinance of Chriſt, for which there is neither Command, nor Example in all God's Word, nor promiſe to ſuch who do it, nor threatning to ſuch who neglect it. But there is no Command or Example in all the Word of God for the Baptizing of little Babes, nor promiſe made to ſuch who are Baptized, nor threatnings to ſuch who are not, Ergo.

That the Child lies under a Promiſe who is Baptized, or the Child under any Threatning or Danger who is not Baptized, let them prove it, ſince it is denyed.

Arg. 13. If no Parents at any time, or times, have been by God the Father, Jeſus Chriſt, or his Apoſtles, either Commended for Baptizing their Children, or Reproved for neglecting to Baptize them, then Infant Baptiſm is no Ordinance of God; But no Parents at any time or times have been by God Commended for baptizing of their Children, nor reprov'd for neglecting to baptize them &c. Ergo Infant Baptiſm is no Ordinance of God.

This Argument will ſtand unanſwerable, unleſs any can ſhew who they were that were ever Commended for Baptizing their Children, or Reproved for neglecting it, or unleſs they can ſhew a Parallel caſe.

Arg. 14. If Men were not to preſume to alter any thing in the Worſhip of God under the Law, neither to add thereto, nor diminiſh therefrom, and God is as ſtrict and jealous of his Worſhip under the Goſpel, then nothing ought to be altered in God's Worſhip un-

der the Gospel ; but under the Law Men were not to presume so to do, and God is as strict and jealous under the Gospel, *Ergo*.

The *Major* cannot be denied.

The *Minor* is clear from *Exod. 25. 40. See thou make all things according to the Pattern shewed thee in the Mount,* and *Lev. 10. 1, 2. See how Nadab and Abihu, spied for presuming to vary from the Command of God, and Uzzab, tho' but in small Circumstances, (as they may seem to us.) How dare Men adventure, this being so, to change Baptism from Dipping into Sprinkling ; and the Subject, from an Adult Believer, to an Ignorant Babe ? Add thou not unto his word, &c.*

Arg. 15. Whatever practice opens a Door to any Human Traditions in God's Worship, is a great Evil, and to be avoided ; But the practice of Infant Baptism opens a Door to any Human Traditions in God's Worship, *Ergo*, to Sprinkle or Baptize Infants is a great Evil, and ought to be avoided.

The *Major* will not be denied.

The *Minor* is clear, because there is no Scripture ground for it, no Command or Example for such a Practice in God's Word, and if without Scripture Authority, the Church hath power to do one thing, she may do another, and so *ad infinitum*.

Arg. 16. Whatsoever practice reflects upon the Honour, Wisdom and Care of Jesus Christ, or renders him less faithful than *Moses* and the New Testament in one of its great Ordinances, nay Sacraments, to lie more obscure in God's Word, than any Law or Precept under the Old Testament, cannot be of God ; But the practice of Infant Baptism reflects on the Honour, Care and Faithfulness of Jesus Christ, and renders him less faithful than *Moses* and a great Ordinance, nay Sacrament, of the New Testament, to lie more dark and obscure than any Precept under the Old Testament, *Ergo*, Infant Baptism cannot be of God.

The *Major* cannot be denied.

The *Minor* is easily proved : For he is bold indeed, who shall affirm Infant Baptism doth not lie obscure in God's Word. One great Party who assert it, say, its not to be found in the Scripture at all, but 'tis an unwritten Apostolical Tradition : Others say, it lies not in

the Letter of the Scripture, but may be proved by Consequences ; and yet some great asserters of it, as Dr. *Hammond* and others say, those Consequences commonly drawn from divers Texts for it, are without demonstration and prove nothing. I am sure a Man may Read the Scripture a Hundred times over and never be thereby convinced, he ought to baptize his Children, though it is powerful to convince Men of all Christian Duties.

Now can this be a Truth, since Christ was more Faithful than *Moses*; and delivered every thing plainly from the Father ? *Moses* left nothing dark as to matters of Duty, tho' the Precept and Eternal Rites of his Law were numerous, even two or three hundred Precepts; yet none were at a loss, or had need to say, is this a Truth or an Ordinance, or not ? for he that Runs may Read it.

And shall one positive precept given forth by Christ, who appointed so few in the New Testament, be so obscure; as also the Ground and End of it, that Men should be confounded about the Proofs of it, together with the End and Grounds thereof ? See *Heb.* 3. 5, 6.

Arg. 17. That Custom or Law which *Moses* never delivered to the *Jews*, nor is any where written in the Old Testament was no Truth of God, or of Divine Authority. But that Custom or Law to baptize Proselytes, either Men, Women or Children, was never given to the *Jews* by *Moses*, nor is it any where written in the Old Testament, *Ergo*, it was no Truth of God, or of Divine Authority; and evident it is, according to that Forementioned and Worthy Author Sir. *Norion Knatchbal*, that the *Jewish Rabbins* differed among themselves about it; for, saith he, 'to Cite his very words 'again, *Rabbi Eleazer* expressly contradicts *Rabbi Joshua*, who was the first I know of, who asserted this sort 'of Baptism among the *Jews*; for *Eleazer*, who was 'contemporary with *Rabbi Joshua*, if he did not live 'before him, asserts, that a Proselyte Circumcised and 'not Baptized was a true Proselyte.

Arg. 18. If Baptism is of Meer positive Right, wholly depending on the Will and Sovereign Pleasure of Jesus Christ, the great Legislator, and he hath not Required or Commanded Infants to be baptized; then Infants-

Infants ought not to be baptized ; but Baptism is of meer positive right, wholly depending on the Will and Sovereign pleasure of Jesus Christ, the great Legislator, and he hath not required or Commanded Infants to be baptized, *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

This Argument tends to cut off all the pretended proofs of Pedit-baptism, taken from the Covenant made with *Abraham* ; and because Children are said to belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, it was not the Right of *Abraham's* Male Children to be Circumcised, because they were begotten, and born of the Fruit of his Loyns, till he received Commandment from God to Circumcise them. Had he done it before, or without Command from God, it would have been Will-worship in him to have done it ; Moreover, this further appears to be so, because no godly Mans Children, nor others in *Abraham's* days, nor since, had any Right thereto, but only his Children, (or such who were bought with his Money, or were profelyted to the Jewish Religion) because they had no Command from God so to do, as *Abraham* had.

This being true, it follows, that if we should grant Infants of believing *Gentiles*, as such, were the Seed of *Abraham*, which we deny, yet unless God had Commanded them to baptize their Children, they ought not to do it ; and if they do it without a Command or Authority from Christ, It will be found an Act of Will-worship in them.

Arg. 19. All that were baptized in the Apostolical Primitive times, were baptized upon the profession of their Faith, were baptized into Christ, and thereby put on Christ, and were all one in Christ Jesus, and were *Abraham's* Seed and Heirs according to the promise. But Infants, as such, who are baptized, were not baptized upon the profession of their Faith, nor did they put on Christ thereby, nor are they all one in Christ Jesus, and also are not *Abraham's* Seed and Heirs, according to Promise. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

Mr. Baxter confirms the substance of the Major, these are his words, *i. e.* *As many as have been baptized have put on Christ, and are all one in Christ Jesus, and are Abraham's Seed, and Heirs according to the promise, Gal. 3. 27, 28, 29.* This speaks the Apostle, saith he, of the

‘ the probability grounded on a credible profession , &c.
 ‘ *Baxters Confirm Reconcil.* page 32.

The *Minor* will stand firm till any can prove Infants by a visible profession have put on Christ; are all one in Christ Jesus, are *Abrahams* Seed and Heirs according to the promise. Evident it is, none are the spiritual Seed of *Abraham*, but such who have the Faith of *Abraham*, and are truly grafted into Christ, by a saving Faith. If any object, we read of some who were baptized, who had no saving Faith but were Hypocrites, I answer, had they appeared to be such, they had not been baptized, nor had they a true Right thereto.

Arg. 20. Baptism is the Solemnizing of the Souls Marriage Union with Christ, which Marriage-contract absolutely requires an actual profession of consent; but Infants are not capable to enter into Marriage Union with Christ, nor to make a profession of an actual consent. *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized.

The *Major* our opposites generally grant, particularly see what Mr. *Baxter* saith, ‘ Our Baptism is our solemnizing of our Marriage with Christ. These are his very words. page 32.

The *Minor* none can deny, no Man, sure in his right mind will assert, that little Babes are capable to enter into a Marriage Relation with Christ; and to make profession of a consent; and the truth is, he in the next words gives away his Cause, *viz.* and ’tis (saith he) ‘ A new and strange kind of Marriage where there is no profession of consent. page 32.

How unhappy was this Man to plead for such a New and strange kind of Marriage, did he find any little Babe he ever Baptized (or rather Rantized) to make a profession of consent to be Married to Jesus Christ. If any should object he speaks of the Baptism of the Adult; I answer his words are these, *Our Baptism is*, &c. Besides will any Pedo-baptist say, That the Baptism of the Adult is the solemnizing of the Souls Marriage with Christ, and not the Baptism of Infants. Reader, observe how our opposites are forced sometimes to speak the Truth, tho’ it overthrows their own practice of Pedo-baptism.

Arg. 21. If the Sins of no persons are forgiven them till they are Converted, then they must not be baptized

zed for the forgiveness of them, till they profess themselves to be Converted ; but the Sins of no Persons till they are Converted are forgiven; *Ergo*, no Person ought to be Baptized for the forgiveness of them, till they profess they are Converted.

Mr. *Baxter* in the said Treatise, lays down the substance of this Argument also, take his own words, *i. e.*
 ' As their sins are not forgiven them till they are Converted, *Mark* 4. 12. So they must not be baptized for the forgiveness of them, till they profess themselves Converted, seeing to the Church *non esse* and *non parere* is all one. Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus, is the Sum of that Preaching that makes Disciples, *Acts* 20. 21. Therefore, saith he, both those must by a Profession seem to be received, before any at Age are baptized. page 30, 31. and evident it is, say I, from hence that none but such at Age ought to be baptized.

' *Philip* caused the *Eunuch* to profess before he would Baptize him, *That he believed that Jesus Christ was the Son of God.* *Saul* had also, saith he, more than a bare profession before Baptism, *Acts* 9. 5, 15, 17. page 28. The Promise it self, saith he, doth expressly require a Faith of our own, of all the Adult, that will have part in the Priviledges; therefore there is a Faith of our own, that is the Condition of our Title, *Mark* 16. 16. page 16.

He might have added by the force of his Argument; therefore Infants should not have the priviledges: For I argue thus, *viz.*

Arg. 22. If there is but one Baptism of Water left by Jesus Christ in the New *Jerusalem*, or but one condition or manner of Right thereto ; and that one Baptism is that of the Adult; then Infant Baptism is no Baptism of Christ; but there is but one Baptism in Water left by Christ in the New Testament, and but one Condition and manner of Right thereto, and that one Baptism is that of the Adult. *Ergo*, Infant Baptism is no Baptism of Christ.

' Mr. *Baxter* saith, Faith and Repentance is the condition of the Adult, and as to any other condition, I am sure the Scripture is silent, The way of the Lord is one, one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism, *Eph.* 4. 4.

' If

‘ If profession of Faith were not necessary, saith Mr. Baxter, *Coram Ecclesia*, to Church Membership and Priviledges, then *Infidels* and *Heathens* would have Right, also, saith he the Church and the World would be confounded. He might have added, but *Infidels* and *Heathens* have no Right to Church Membership, &c. *Ergo*.

‘ Tis a granted case among all Christians, saith he, that profession is thus necessary, the *Apostles*, and *Antient Church* admitted none without it. page 21. And if so, why dare any now a days admit of Infants, who are incapable to make profession? He adds, ‘ Yea Christ in his Commission directeth his Apostles to make Disciples and then Baptize them, promising, *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*, Mark 16. 16. page 27. Furthermore he saith, ‘ *If as many as are baptized into Christ, are baptized into his Death, and are Buried with him by baptism into Death, that like as Christ was raised from the Dead, so we also should walk in newness of Life*, &c. Then no doubt, saith he, but such as were to be baptized did first profess this mortification, and a consent to be buried, &c. In our Baptism we put off the Body of the Sins of the Flesh, by the Circumcision of Christ, *being buried with him and raised with him through Faith, quickened with him, and having all our Trespases forgiven*, Coll. 2. 11, 12, 13. and will any Man, says he, yea will Paul ascribe all this to those that did not so much as profess the things signified? Will Baptism in the Judgment of a wise Man, do all this for an *Infidel*, (or, say I, for an Infant) that cannot make a profession that he is a Christian. page 31, 32. he proceeds.

Arg. 23. The baptized are in Scripture called Men Washed, Sanctified, Justified; they are called Saints, and Churches of Saints. 1 Cor. 1. 2. all Christians are Sanctified ones; page 33. now let me add the *Minor*.

But Infants are not in Scripture called Men Washed, Sanctified, Justified; they are not called Saints, Churches of Saints, Christians, nor Sanctified ones, *Ergo*, Infants ought not to be baptized. If any should say why did you not cite these assertions of Mr. Baxters whilst he was living? I answer, more then Eighteen years ago, I did recite and Print these assertions, and many other

Argu-

Arguments of his to the same purpose, to which he gave no answer.

Arg. 24. If there is but one way for all, both Parents and Children to be admitted in the Gospel Church, to the end of the World, and that it is upon profession of Faith to be baptized; then both Parents and Children must upon the profession of their Faith be baptized, and so admitted, &c. But there is but one way for all, both Parents and Children to be admitted into the Gospel-Church to the end of the World, and that is upon the profession of their Faith to be Baptized, *Ergo.*

Arg. 25. That cannot be Christ's true baptism wherein there is not, cannot be a lively Representation of the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Jesus Christ, together with our Death unto Sin, and vivification to a New Life; but in the Rantizing or Sprinkling of an Infant there is not, cannot be a lively Representation of Christ's Death, Burial and Resurrection, &c.

Arg. 26. That pretended Baptism that pretends to frustrate the glorious end and design of Christ in his Instituting of Gospel Baptism, or cannot answer it, is none of Christ's Baptism; but the pretended baptism of Infants tends to frustrate the glorious end and design of Christ in Instituting of Gospel Baptism, *Ergo.*

The *Major* will not be denied.

As to the *Minor*, all generally confess the end and design of Christ in Instituting the Ordinance of Baptism, was in a lively Figure to represent his Death, Burial and Resurrection; with the Persons Death unto Sin, and his rising again to walk in newness of Life, that is baptized; as the Sacrament of the Supper was ordained to represent his Body was broke, and his blood was shed. But that a lively Figure of Christs Death, Burial and Resurrection, appears in Sprinkling a little Water on the Face, I see not, (and as done to an Infant) there can no Death to sin, and rising again to walk in Newness of Life be signified; and therefore Christs design and end therein is frustrated.

Arg. 27. If Baptism be Immersion, as to the proper and genuine Signification of the word *Baptizo* as also of those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms, and the Spiritual Signification thereof; then Sprinkling cannot be Christs true Baptism. But Immersion is the proper and genuine

genuine signification of the word *Baptizo*, and also of those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms spoken of, and the spiritual signification thereof, *Ergo*, Sprinkling is not Christ's true Baptism.

1. That the proper and genuine signification of the word *Baptizo* is Immersion, or to Dip, &c. We have fully proved, which is also confessed by all Learned in that Language.

2. That the Typical Baptism, *viz.* that of the *Red Sea*, wherein the Fathers were buried, as it were unto *Moses* in the Sea, and under the Cloud, appears from *Pools Annotations*. 1 *Cor.* 10. 2. 'Others, (saith he) more probably think that the Apostle useth this Term, in regard of the great Analogy betwixt *Baptism* (as it was then used) the Persons going down into the Waters, and being Dipp'd; and the *Israelites* going down into the Sea, the great receptacle of water, tho' the water at that time was gathered on heaps on either side of them; yet they seemed buried in the water, as Persons in that Age were when they were baptized, &c. The second was that of *Noah's Ark*; See Sir *Norton Knatchbul*, who I before Quoted, and shall here again recite his words.

'The Ark of *Noah*, and *Baptism*, (saith he) were both a Type and Figure of the Resurrection, not the Sign of the washing away of Sin, tho' so taken Metonymically, but a particular signal of the Resurrection of Christ. Of this, Baptism is a Lively and Emphatical Figure, as also was the Ark of *Noah*, out of which he returned as from a Sepulchre, to a New Life.

3. Metaphorical Baptism is that of the Spirit, and of affliction: The first signifies not a Sprinkling of the Spirit, but the great Effusion of the Spirit, like that at *Pentecost*, *Acts* 1. 4, 5. *Shall be Baptized*, &c. On which words *Causabon* speaks thus: See Dr. *Du Veil* on *Acts* 2. The Greek word *ΒΑΠΤΙΖΩ* is to Dip or Plunge, as it were to die Colours, in which sense, (saith he) the Apostles might be truly said to have been baptized, for the House in which this was done, was filled with the Holy Ghost; so that the Apostles might seem to have been plunged into it, as into a large Fish-Pond. Also *Decumentus* on *Acts* 2. saith, 'A wind filled the whole House, that it seemed like a Fish-Pond,

‘ Pond, because it was promised to the Apostles, that they should be baptized with the Holy Ghost. And the Baptism of afflictions are those great depths or overwhelming of afflictions, like that of our Saviours (*magnis componere parva*) no part free, *Mat. 20. 22.* where you have the same word *Βαπτισμῶ*, and like that of *David*, who saith, *God drew him out of deep waters.*

4. The spiritual signification thereof is the Death, Burial and Resurrection of Christ, and of our Death to sin, and vivification to a New Life.

This being so, it follows undeniably that Sprinkling cannot be Christs true baptism; it must be Immersion and nothing else.

And in the last place, *finally*, to confirm that *Βαπτισμῶ* is to *Dip*, both from the literal and spiritual signification thereof, as also from those Typical and Metaphorical Baptisms mentioned in the Scripture. I might add further that this evidently appears from the practice of *John Baptist*, and the Apostles of Christ, who baptized in *Rivers*, and *where there was much water*; and also because the Baptizer and Baptized, are said to go down *into* the water (not down *to* the water) and came up out of the water. *John Baptist* is said to baptize them *into* (*εἰς*) *Jordan* as the Greek renders it, which shews it Dipping and not Sprinkling. Would it be proper to say, he Sprinkled them *into Jordan*. The Lord open the Eyes of those who see not, to consider these things.

Sir, I expect your answer to these Arguments particularly if you make any reply to what I have said in confutation of your Treatise, and see you do your business better the next time, for as yet you have not proved Infant Baptism to be from Heaven, as I hope the unprejudiced Reader will conclude: I shall say no more at present; but leave all I have said to the blessing of God, hoping in a little time he will vanquish by the light of his sacred word, your Scripture less practice of Infant Baptism out of the World clear up the Truth of his own despised Ordinance, *That Wisdom may be Justified of her Children*, and God may be Honoured, to whom be Glory now and for ever more. *Amen.*

